

ing here since 11 o'clock this morning to offer this simple amendment.

Mr. McNARY. The usual way, when the Senator gets recognition tomorrow, is to offer the amendment, thus giving notice to everyone of the matter expected to be discussed. I shall have to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from Utah.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art most near and yet so far, whose gifts are boundless and grace so free, we thank Thee for Thy love—the anchor to which our souls may hold in storm and tempest, in honor or dishonor, poverty or wealth; it never faileth. We pray Thee to lift us above all pride of place and ambition, and with dignity and calm may we pursue the functions of our sacred office. Heavenly Father, let strength and courage come with the memory of the past. We praise Thee for the chivalrous souls that builded here in years long ago, and for the patriotic hosts to whom this New World was as the very gate of Heaven. Here were the prophets' voice and the seers' vision; here youth gathered courage for its daring dreams, and patriots paid the priceless boon for liberty. O grant, blessed Lord, that their sacrificial devotion may ever remain to us a most precious heritage and unto Thee be eternal praise. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNIVERSARY OF COMMENCEMENT OF FIRST SESSION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 33, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make plans and suitable arrangements for the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of the first session of the Supreme Court of the United States, to be held February 1, 1940, the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM of New York, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. KEOGH of New York, Mr. GUYER of Kansas, and Mr. MICHENER of Michigan.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a speech made by William H. Seward in the United States Senate on March 11, 1850.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain figures of a survey I made of the radio stations of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter he received from a constituent and a brief statement by a former Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of other special orders now on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a short newspaper article bearing upon the subject of my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other special orders have been concluded, I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes next Tuesday after the regular business on the Speaker's table has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the Dies committee list of Government employees and officials who are members of the Communist created, dominated, and controlled American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. GEYER of California. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief submitted by the National Grange to the United States Tariff Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Johnstown Democrat, of Johnstown, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Adolph Starr, of Lafayette, Ind., on the subject of patriotism versus neutrality, which appeared in the Lafayette Leader on October 6, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution commending the Congress on its flood-control position.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Lima (Ohio) News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the special orders already made are disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE SPECIAL SESSION AND PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, when the President called the special session of Congress he made the special request to the Members of the House and the Senate to refrain from indulging in partisan politics. The Members on both sides of the aisle in this House, so far as I have been able to learn, have followed the President's request. I might say, however, in looking over the newspapers and reading the speeches made by various members of the President's Cabinet and other New Deal associates, that they have not followed that practice. For instance, Secretary Wallace gave out a statement the other day, I think in San Francisco, in which he injected politics by urging President Roosevelt to run for a third term. Other New Deal officials have made political speeches out of harmony with the President's non-political request.

NEW DEAL GAG RULE

For more than 30 days in this special session of Congress Democratic leaders have denied the membership of the House the right to consider important domestic problems which directly affect the future welfare of the American people. It may be that the President considers all domestic problems to be political. But when we look at the welfare of the farmers of this country, the unemployed, and distressed business, I am positive that those of our citizens who are so affected do not regard their problems as being political in any manner. The fact that we have been denied the right in this special session of Congress to consider these important domestic problems should be classed as a direct slap at the present and future welfare of the American people.

NEUTRALITY FIGHT A SMOKE SCREEN TO COVER UP

The neutrality fight, for which the special session was called, is more or less of a smoke screen intended to divert the people's minds off from the critical domestic situation. The war hysteria which has been developed has largely accomplished this purpose, despite the fact that the American people, through its Congress, have already decided to remain neutral and to keep out of the European war.

I wonder if the President and his associates feel that the war will solve our domestic problems and, therefore, have denied the right to Congress to consider them at this special session? Does the President believe that the European war, unless we get into it, will put our 10,000,000 unemployed back to work? Does he believe that the European war will feed the 20,000,000 American citizens now on public relief? Does he advocate the continuance of the war so as to bring about an increase in the price level of farm products?

Yes; the farm prices started to go up in September, the first 5 days of the war, and then Secretary Wallace made his famous statement to the effect that there was no justification for increased prices on farm products because of an abundance of supplies, and then prices went down. Today they are nearly back to pre-war level.

Does the President feel that the continuation of the war will solve our labor problem so as to avoid the necessity for the adoption of highly important amendments to the wage-and-hour law which is now destroying small business and agriculture throughout the country? Does he feel that the war will do away with the necessity of adopting amendments to the Wagner labor relations law in order to give both business and labor a square deal? His attitude in regard to domestic problems, which has been carried out by Democratic leaders in Congress, has put a gag rule on the American people and stopped them from giving consideration to scores of domestic problems which should be taken up in this special session of Congress for immediate solution and action.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL STAY OUT OF EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. Speaker, the American people are determined to keep out of the European war. They believe in strict and honest neutrality. The neutrality law now on our statute books can be strengthened, without controversy and war hysteria, so that the United States may remain neutral and at peace with the world. The young manhood of our country should never again be forced to fight on foreign soil. [Applause.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry, but I cannot yield now. This determination to stay out of the European war will leave us free to work for a solution of our own domestic problems. Congress should stay in session and set its own house in order here in this country.

OFFICIALS SEEK TO DESTROY AGRICULTURE AND BUSINESS

What are some of these New Dealers doing to inject politics in our present-day discussion, so as to prepare for a third term? In addition to what Secretary Wallace said the other day in San Francisco and his statement to depress farm prices, the Department of Justice is cracking down on business, trying to put people out of business when they should be aiding in providing work for the unemployed of this country in the factories and on the farms of the United States.

This idea of making speeches to continue low farm prices prevailing in this country is an outrage when you consider that we are appropriating nearly a billion dollars for benefit payments to supplement the farmers' income for 1939. The farmers do not want to be on the bounty list of the Federal Government. All they ask for is decent prices so that they can have a good, fair American income with which to buy the products of industry and enjoy an American standard of living. This war scare has been largely imbued with propaganda to keep people in a state of fear and confusion and to keep their minds off their home troubles.

GIVING AWAY OUR HOME MARKET

One of the things that is being slipped over on the farmers of this country is the continued effort on the part of the administration to give away our home market to foreign producers. Trade agreements are being negotiated with various countries, and when the minds of the people are on keeping out of war they find that we have officials in Government circles who are dealing them out of their houses and homes. All trade agreement negotiations should be suspended during the duration of the war [applause], and when the act comes up for extension in January or February it should be repealed. If it is not repealed, some other action should be taken so as to stop the administration from giving away the American markets. [Applause.]

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is familiar with the fact that I introduced recently a bill which would provide for Senate ratification of all future trade agreements. [Applause.] I am wondering if the gentleman does not agree that that is necessary if we are going to properly protect agriculture, particularly the livestock industry, in view of these agreements that are in contemplation at the present time—namely, trade agreements with the Argentine and Uruguay?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say the gentleman is absolutely correct, unless we can repeal it. I am with the gentleman, unless we can repeal the act, because we should either repeal it or we should provide for Senate ratification.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman think that Congress should at least regain a part of this power that has been delegated, at least to the extent of providing for Senate ratification of these trade agreements, the same as is provided for other treaties with foreign nations?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Not only power in that respect, but we should restore to Congress a great many other powers that have been delegated to the President and his associates.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. I dislike to find myself in disagreement with the gentleman—

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry. I would like to yield to the gentleman for a lengthy statement, but I cannot do it now. Let me conclude my speech and I will call on you if I have time.

I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] to what has happened with respect to the cattle situation. In 1933, the first year of the New Deal, 74,000 head of cattle were imported into this country. In 1937, 494,000 head of cattle were imported. In 1938, the first 9 months, from January 1 to October 1, 295,000 head were imported; but during the same period of this year, for 9 months, 604,015 head of cattle, as against 295,000 in the same period a year ago, came into this country.

In the first 9 months of this year 69,000,000 pounds of canned beef were imported as against 58,000,000 pounds in the same period last year. We noticed immediately that after the President made his celebrated statement in March, in which he said that Argentine beef was better and cheaper than American beef, the people of this country, not only the Navy, but the people generally, acted upon the President's recommendation and started to purchase larger quantities of Argentine canned beef. So there we have the picture of increasing imports, giving away our American markets to the detriment of American farmers and workers, when they should have this market if we are to protect them and their American standard of living.

ARGENTINE TRADE AGREEMENT

It was a pathetic sight the other day down before the Committee for Reciprocity Information when 75 Members of this House and Senators appeared in opposition to the trade agreement with Argentina. Democrats and Republicans alike came there to plead with an agency of the Federal Government, set up by the Congress, to protect our own American citizens. What the distinguished Senators and my colleagues said to the Committee should be a warning to the administration to change its tactics and encourage them to return to the traditional American course of protecting our farmers and the citizens of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Should it not also be a warning to Congress not to surrender any more of its powers to the administration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The proposed trade agreement with Argentina covers a cross section of the United States. Its effects will extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry I cannot yield.

It proposes that the duties will be cut on the following generally produced commodities of the United States:

Beef and veal, cured and canned; casein, a product of milk; cheese; turkeys; eggs; flaxseed; linseed oil; wool; hides; corn; and other farm products. Here we have a supply of corn of over 3,000,000,000 bushels, one of the largest supplies of corn we have had in the history of this country. In fact, we have a surplus of every commodity included in the list except wool and flaxseed. Both of these latter products

can be produced in this country in sufficient quantity to take care of domestic needs if our farmers are given the opportunity to do so.

Flaxseed can be profitably grown in the spring-wheat area. The farmers in this section should be encouraged to grow flaxseed on some of the millions of acres of wheatland which was taken out of production under the New Deal farm program. At least 5,000,000 acres of land could be used for flax production to take care of domestic needs. Such activity will stimulate production of a necessary crop, bring additional income to thousands of farmers, and provide employment for idle men.

Production of wool can be stimulated in all parts of the country as a new industry which will help to do away with surplus production of other farm commodities. But when the administration lowers the duty on wool and flaxseed American farmers are driven out of this type of farming, and the entire country is left to the mercy of foreign speculators in these commodities.

Argentina, of course, has approximately 50,000,000 bushels of surplus corn they want to get rid of; so the administration proposes to cut the duty on corn when we already have a surplus, and let the Argentine farmers ship that corn in here to glut the market and further depress the price for American farmers.

The only things Argentina produces are competitive farm commodities, the same things we produce in the United States. These are the only things they are going to use in trade. We will have to let them send in the commodities I have enumerated that are produced generally throughout the United States. Again I say this means that we will have a glutted market, lower prices, and further depressed conditions throughout this country for all farm products.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PITTINGER. Is it not true that the proposed reciprocal trade agreement with Argentina will directly affect the dairy and agricultural interests of Minnesota?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not only in Minnesota but it will affect those interests all over the country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly it does on all commodities that are produced in the United States, and it will be of particular damage to dairy and poultry farmers. One of the leading Senators from Texas and Members of this House from Texas, as well as my good friend from Oregon, were down before the President's committee and vigorously and vehemently protested against cutting the duties on farm products. We stood there as one man speaking for the interests of the American farmers before an administration or a committee which was determined to act as Santa Claus to foreign producers; to help them instead of helping our own people. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did not the Republican membership of this House warn the Democrats as to what would happen if they passed the reciprocal trade law originally? They went into it with their eyes open. Now they are crying because the very things we told them would happen, are happening.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that, but it has gotten beyond political considerations. This is an American issue for members of all parties to join together on, and try to save the American market for the American people.

Remember, this agreement with Argentina is not a thing that applies solely and singly to that country, but Japan, Russia, and every other country in the world except Germany will get the full benefit of the reduced duties in the agreement.

Another agreement is being proposed for Uruguay containing the same commodities as are contained in the agreement with Argentina. This, of course, is just fooling the people of Uruguay because if they reduce the duty for Argentina, Uruguay gets the benefit of the same reductions.

FEW BENEFITS FOR INDUSTRY

There are but a very few exporters who will be benefited by this treaty. They might sell a few more automobiles in

foreign trade, and a few radios. I doubt if they will sell any washing machines. They may sell a few American-made products, but very few. Let me tell you this, Mr. Speaker: I would rather see the incomes of the farmers of Oregon, Iowa, and the other States of this Union supplemented so they could buy the products of American industry, and put American men back to work. [Applause.] American citizens are the best customers we have, our own American people; and we Members of Congress should make it our business to see that they get the income, and that it is not given to the cheap labor of other countries.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does not the gentleman's argument as to the Argentine agreement apply to every other trade agreement that has been entered into by this administration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. What I am saying here applies to every other trade agreement that has been approved and put through, and to every other trade agreement that will be entered into. Before June 12 next they are going to try to put through all of the agreements because that is the expiration date of the existing law.

HELPING AGRICULTURE

You know there are things that seem mighty strange and funny. For many years our Government has spent billions of dollars to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. We improved the quality of our livestock herds, we improved the quality of our grains, we sought to do away with insect pests that were destroying billions of dollars worth of products. Even Secretary Wallace developed a new type of hybrid corn that increased the production of corn from 20 to 30 percent above normal.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly I do not object to that. I object to the inconsistency of the whole thing. That is what has happened over a score of years; and the Government wanted to do that, we wanted to help the farmers improve their livestock and raise better grain and other farm products; we are all for that. On the other hand, however, for the last 7 years we have spent billions of dollars to produce less because we were producing too much, and we took 40,000,000 acres of land out of cultivation because we had done so well under the spending of billions before that time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That was done under the program conceived by Mordecai Ezekiel, the real New Deal Secretary of Agriculture whose name was on the red list given out by the Dies committee yesterday.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not fair to make Mordecai Ezekiel the goat for a lot of dreamers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But here we are taking 40,000,000 acres of land out of production because the farmers are producing too much, and we are spending billions of dollars to reimburse farmers so that their income may be supplemented to give them an American standard of living.

Then we find, in addition, the New Deal is proceeding to give away the domestic market that our farmers heretofore had to cheap foreign production. That is what they are doing in the trade agreement with Argentina. That is what they are doing in every other trade agreement that has been negotiated, because those trade agreements have been a detriment to both agriculture and industry and has stopped recovery in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we should stay in session. The business of the Congress in this session should be to protect American farmers, American laboring men, and American industry, and not destroy them. Let us therefore override the President's

desire or demand that we do not consider any other legislation. Let us stay in session and get down to business and solve these domestic problems in order to save our own country.

We will not go into the European war. The American people are against it and the Congress is against it. The Congress will therefore see to it that no executive agency of the Government involves us in that European war.

I think if we are going to act as a Santa Claus to anybody we should act as a Santa Claus to American citizens. [Applause.] We will not be serving them if we do not protect the American market for them. They are entitled to have this protection, and I, for one, demand that we stay here and solve some of these difficult problems affecting our own welfare. I know that many of my colleagues will join with me in that demand. Let us put our own house in order.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe the gentleman referred to the fact that Germany had not been permitted to participate in these trade agreements under the most-favored-nation clause.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has Germany been excluded from participation under that clause ever since the program started?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Probably not the first ones, but in the case of all the later agreements Germany has been excluded.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is my understanding that the most-favored-nation clause has never been extended to Germany for any trade agreement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of any reason why that condition should have existed prior to the declaration of war?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The only point I make on that is that Germany was paying a subsidy for the exportation of its farm and other commodities, which subsidy runs contrary to our dumping laws.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true that we paid a subsidy on some of our exports of agricultural products long before war was declared?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; and when the gentleman mentions the paying of a subsidy, may I say that we paid a subsidy of approximately 30 cents a bushel to get rid of wheat in the last year, and we did get rid of considerable wheat; but one strange thing about that is that apparently some of these war lords over there in Europe knew this war was going to take place, so they drove the price of wheat down to the lowest point that it had been in 350 years; then we paid them 30 cents a bushel to take it out of the country.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In answer to the question the gentleman from Michigan asks, may I point out that the barter system of trading which Germany practices does not lend itself to reciprocal trade, neither does it very readily lend itself to any form of trade in which America has traditionally engaged.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does our subsidized exports of wheat and subsidized exports of cotton as we are now doing lend itself to the most-favored clause of the reciprocal-trade agreements?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think it does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; neither do I.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman get me additional time?

Mr. COX. I cannot guarantee that; but I would like for the gentleman to yield to me if he will.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia now.

Mr. COX. I do not want to be impolite and insist upon the gentleman yielding.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no gentleman in the House for whom I have a higher regard than I have for the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. And the gentleman knows something of my confidence in him and my deep affection for him. I must say regretfully that the gentleman has not been fair in the statements he has made with reference to the policy of the State Department or the administration, nor has he been fair in what he said with reference to our trade agreements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman point out where I have not been fair?

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will remain here until I have had opportunity to at least attempt to make an answer to what he stated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be delighted.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has undertaken to create the impression in this body and throughout the country that the Department of State has deliberately sought to take advantage of the disturbed condition that prevails in the minds of the people of this country to put something over on the farmer, to give away his home markets, with the result that the farmers will be disadvantaged and that other industry will be advantaged.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. I intended to point out what is taking place.

Mr. COX. Now I want to ask the gentleman what evidence has developed thus far in the hearings that have been held by the State Department that indicates there is any intention on the part of the administration to give away the home market of any agricultural commodity?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Let me say this further to the gentleman: The gentleman has sought to leave the impression that agriculture has suffered as a result of the trade agreements that have thus far been set up.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman, for he is correct as to my intention.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask the gentleman, What does he find in congressional tariffs that have been of comfort to the farmer? In other words, is the gentleman taking the position that agriculture has suffered a disadvantage under the trade agreements compared with what it formerly enjoyed under congressional tariffs? Does the gentleman want this country to return to the Smoot-Hawley tariff unaffected by the agreements that have been made between the United States and other countries?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to return to the time when the cotton farmers of the South got an average of 17 cents a pound for cotton, as they did during the 12 years of Republican administration. [Applause.] I want to return to the time when our dairy farmers got from 40 to 60 cents a pound for butterfat. [Applause.] I want to return to the time when the cattle farmers were protected on their American market. I want to see to it that our people here get the proper protection to which they are entitled. I want to return to the time when the American laboringman had a decent job at American wages. The gentleman has not misunderstood me and I hope the country does not misunderstand me. Because of the trade agreements that have been negotiated, wherein agricultural commodities were covered, the duties were cut, imports entered into this country beyond former imports, the markets were glutted, and prices were depressed, and our American farmers have suffered distress, as a result, from one end of the country to the other. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot yield further.

Mr. COX. The gentleman ought to yield at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have given the gentleman 5 minutes of my time and I now have only 5 minutes left. I always have the highest regard for the gentleman. He is one of my real warm friends. His judgment is generally very good and I have gone along with him scores of times in this House and stand ready to follow him in the future, but not when it comes to giving away our market to cheap foreign production in other countries of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL and Mr. GORE rose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot yield now.

Let me tell you something about the price situation in my home town today. You talk about farm prices. My farmers are getting 73 cents a bushel for No. 1 wheat and 39 cents a bushel for rye. They are getting 32 to 49 cents a bushel for barley, 25 cents a bushel for oats, and from 30 to 37 cents a bushel for corn. Eggs are selling from 11 cents for pullet eggs to 23 cents for No. 1 eggs. Butter is selling for 32 cents a pound and cream 28 cents; poultry, from 5 cents to 9 cents a pound is what the farmers are receiving. And still, in this proposed trade agreement the President is contemplating cutting the duty on turkeys from 10 cents to a maximum cut of 5 cents, and I suppose that is what they will do because they cut the duty on live turkeys from 8 cents to 4 cents in the Canadian agreement, and the price of turkeys today is 5 cents a pound lower than what it was last year.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is that why we now have two Thanksgiving Days?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have not thought about that.

Mr. HILL and Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; I cannot yield just now. Let me answer that question.

Last year, in 1938, we had a supply of 26,000,000 turkeys. This year—and I do not know who arranged it—we have 32,000,000 turkeys. This answers the gentleman from Wisconsin. So we can have a turkey on the 23d and a turkey on the 30th, to be properly thankful to the administration that fixed the two dates for the bounteous blessings that have been heaped on the American people.

I yield now to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman please explain the attitude of your distinguished Vice Presidential candidate last year, Colonel Knox, of Chicago, on the question of trade with South America?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot explain it, and I do not follow him. I am here to protect citizens of my country.

Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. KNUTSON rose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield first to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman speaks about wanting to return to certain prices. I agree with some things the gentleman has said. As now, the gentleman always contributes a great deal of information to the House when he speaks.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But would the gentleman want to return to 3-cent hogs, 2- and 3-cent beef, 25-cent wheat, and 6- or 7-cent cotton, the condition that existed in the spring of 1933?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will answer the gentleman. Of course not. But I do want to put the farmers back to where they can get an American income. While they did not get it in 1932 because of the world depression, during the 12 years of the administration the gentleman has condemned, the Republican administration—

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman does not want to return to the prices of the Hoover administration, does he?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. During the 12 years of Republican administration, including 1932, the average price

level was from 25 to 50 percent higher than it has been at any time under the New Deal.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman read some market figures a few moments ago; were they based upon the 59-cent dollar of the New Deal or the former Republican 100-cent gold dollar?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The prices I referred to were under the 100-cent dollar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I very much dislike to get tangled up with my good friend from Montana, but I suggest to the gentleman who is speaking to ask him if he wants to turn his beet-sugar market in Montana over to Cuba through a reciprocal trade agreement policy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can answer, I think, for the gentleman from Montana. I do not believe he wants to give any of our American markets away to foreign producers; neither do I, and neither should any other Member of this House; and therefore as friends of the American people, elected here to represent the interests of our own citizens, let us make it our business from now on to protect the welfare of our own people rather than trying to be Santa Claus for the rest of the people of the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for 2 more minutes to answer a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman think it would be for the good of the Nation if we, as a Congress, would refuse to adjourn and then try to do something in this coming month about taking away from the President and the State Department the power they now have to give away our American markets?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We have been sitting here for 30 days twiddling our thumbs in our seats for a few minutes each day doing nothing, when we should have been working and could have been working for the welfare of the American people; and let me say further, with all due respect to our distinguished Speaker, he found there was a drought situation in certain States and so he formed a bloc here in Congress of both Republicans and Democrats to get \$50,000,000 to aid those drought-stricken people. He threatened that we would take it up here in this special session of Congress, when it was supposed that we could not consider any other matter, and then the President turned around yesterday and gave him the \$50,000,000 for the worthy cause of aiding those in need.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to make this observation, inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me. I want to assure the gentleman and the Members of this House that I have always stood, and stand now, for reserving the American markets for the American producers. [Applause.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I stated that much myself in answer to a gentleman, because I knew how the gentleman felt, and I can only add that I wish the gentleman would come over on our side of the aisle and help us put through some of the doctrines that we believe are for the welfare of the American people.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I simply want to ask a question, and anybody in the House can answer it who desires. Do you believe, if we had followed the regular practice of

having the Senate ratify these agreements, that a single one of these trade agreements would have been enacted in the form they are in now?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course not. There would not have been any trade agreements, because no sane Senate on earth would have ratified any agreement that has been made.

Mr. REED of New York. The other countries ratify them through their legislative bodies, or at least most of them do so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is right. The foreign legislative bodies quickly ratify the agreements because they get the best end of the deal at the expense of American citizens. Let us put a stop to this injurious policy and immediately begin work in Congress to put our own house in order. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE TRADE-TREATY PROGRAM

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, had I been aware of the nature of the address that the distinguished Member from Minnesota expected to deliver I would have asked that the time allotted me be given to him, because he has covered the very matter that I wanted to deal with, and at the same time I feel that he can do it so much more ably than I can that he should be the one to speak in behalf of our side in relation to the trade-treaty program.

Practically all of this session has been devoted to the subject of neutrality. This is the all-absorbing subject at the present time, not only in both branches of the Congress, but in the country at large. Therefore it perhaps is a little difficult to turn the current of thought from the foreign policy of this country and other countries to a subject of very great and important domestic interest.

PUBLIC ATTENTION DIVERTED FROM DOMESTIC ISSUES

While I have no doubt that the administration and the administration leaders are glad to have the attention of the people at least temporarily diverted from its failure and its ruinous policies, nevertheless I feel that we of the Republican minority have a duty to see to it that these domestic issues are not forgotten. I do not intend to allow the war situation to interfere with my interest in domestic problems, and there is no greater issue today than the trade-treaty program, the administration of which has been such a signal failure.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. A year ago it was the Supreme Court; now it is neutrality. The gentleman recalls that the old-fashioned mother, when the baby was colicky and ailing, would put molasses on its fingers and then hand it a feather to play with. I am wondering if these two issues are not feathers.

Mr. TREADWAY. I say this in support of the administration, in answer to the gentleman's comparison, that such issues as the trade-treaty program and the Supreme Court issue were of our own making, whereas the matters arising out of the question of our neutrality, in which we are so deeply involved at the present time, are not, fortunately, of our making here in this country. I shall not make any reference to that today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this one subject the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has so ably touched upon. His remarks were limited largely to a discussion of agricultural difficulties resulting from the trade-treaty program. I think the question is much larger than that, and so does he. It affects every producer in the United States—labor, industry, agriculture, and everything else having to do with the well-being of our country. Therefore it is much broader than simply a discussion of agriculture, meritorious as was his argument in relation to that subject. Let us get beyond that one idea and include everything having to do with the well-being of this country.

EXPORTS WERE ALREADY ON INCREASE WHEN TREATY PROGRAM WAS ADOPTED

It will be recalled that this program was inaugurated in 1934 for the avowed purpose of expanding our export trade. That was the excuse given originally for the adoption of the unconstitutional trade-treaty program—an expansion of our export trade. One of the arguments made in behalf of the program was that it was the only means by which we could hope to regain our former prosperous export business.

This contention was made despite the fact that at that time our export trade was rapidly on the increase from the low point it had reached at the depth of the world-wide depression in 1932. We have every reason to believe that this upward trend would have continued even without the treaty program. The treaty program was not the means of increasing our foreign trade. It was simply a coincidence that the trade-treaty program was adopted at a time when we were on the upward trend anyway.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take the Argentine situation at the moment. Heretofore Germany has supplied Argentina with the principal portion of her iron and steel products. Suppose we get the Argentine agreement into operation now and that business automatically falls into our hands due to the European situation. It will then be quite natural for someone to claim that that business is the direct result of the trade agreement.

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course, the gentleman is right. They will take the credit for any increased exports, and even for any decline in imports, although, as we know, no tariff duties have ever been increased under the treaty program.

What happened in the time of the Wilson administration, when we had a free-trade tariff bill? The war made an artificial trade barrier and brought about a protective tariff that the Democratic Congress would never otherwise have written, and brought prosperity back to the country. Does the gentleman not agree with that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I do.

EXPORTS TO MANY NONTREATY COUNTRIES HAVE INCREASED MORE THAN TO TREATY COUNTRIES

Mr. TREADWAY. To continue my remarks, it can be shown that our exports to many nontreaty countries have increased to a greater extent than have our exports to countries with which we have entered into treaties and granted concessions in our home market.

It is my purpose today to prove that the treaty program has not accomplished the purpose in regaining our export market.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES UNNECESSARILY SACRIFICED

In my opinion, we have unnecessarily and unjustly sacrificed our domestic market and our domestic producers in trying to expand our foreign trade through the present trade-treaty program.

In considering the alleged benefits of the treaty program, we must not overlook the price we have had to pay, not only in the concessions we have made to individual treaty countries but in the extension of those concessions to the whole world with no compensating benefit to us. That applies, as the gentleman from Minnesota so well pointed out in his remarks, to the benefits that Argentina will secure under this proposed treaty, and that will be extended to other countries as well, without the slightest return to us. We have given up far more than we have received. American agriculture, labor, and industry have had their birthright, the American home market, traded off for a mess of pottage. Let us look after our own affairs a little bit and take care of the domestic problems here at home before extending these rights and privileges in our market to foreign countries.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact—I believe the gentleman has already pointed it out generally—that

very few manufacturers in this country are benefited, to any material extent, by these trade agreements?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would say that is absolutely true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not only is this constitutional feature involved, but does the gentleman know of any basis in the trade-agreement act itself that authorizes the reductions in excise taxes which are proposed or listed for consideration in some of the announcements now out?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I know of no such basis.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman discuss the effect upon imports coming into this country, of the reduced value of foreign currencies?

Mr. TREADWAY. No, I am not touching on that subject today, because I am trying to bring up some comparisons of treaty and nontreaty countries. I am not touching on that phase of the question which is, by itself, an important subject for discussion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But is it not a fact that with respect to commodities contained in the agreement with Canada and Great Britain, the duties have been reduced about 15 or 20 percent additional?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes, as a result of exchange fluctuations due to the depreciation of the British pound.

STATE DEPARTMENT'S PROPAGANDA MACHINE TRIES TO PAINT FAVORABLE PICTURE

Taking up the question of the alleged benefits of the treaty program, we find the State Department propaganda machine trying to paint a favorable picture by pointing out that our combined exports to treaty countries have increased to a greater degree than our combined exports to nontreaty countries.

At first blush, this may sound like a plausible argument in favor of the treaty program, but when we look to our trade with the individual countries within each group, it becomes apparent that the result shown is a mere coincidence.

Increased exports to treaty countries are not consistently greater than to nontreaty countries. On the contrary, many instances can be cited where exports to nontreaty countries have increased far more than in the case of treaty countries.

EXAMPLES OF INCREASED TRADE WITH NONTREATY COUNTRIES

Let me cite a few instances, comparing the average exports in 1934 and 1935 with 1937 and 1938. Turning first to Latin America, here is what we find:

In the case of Colombia and Guatemala the exports increased 84 and 81 percent, respectively. These are both treaty countries. However, our exports to Venezuela, a nontreaty country, increased by 161 percent. You do not get any of that information through the State Department propaganda on trade treaties.

Thus, so far as those three countries are concerned, we fared best without any trade treaty. That is apt to be the case right along.

Let us take two other countries similarly situated—Brazil and Argentina. We have a treaty with the former, but not with the latter, although one is now under negotiation, which has been so thoroughly discussed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], this morning. Our exports to Brazil, the treaty country, increased 56 percent, but exports to Argentina, the nontreaty country, increased 97 percent.

Again, we got along very well without a treaty. How do the advocates of the trade-treaty program account for that comparison? Let us not forget this fact—that our trade with Argentina increased nearly 100 percent without our making a single concession to her products in the American market. So why negotiate a treaty with them now for their benefit—not ours? All we got from Brazil, after making a number of concessions to her products, was a 56-percent increase. How do we know but that our exports would not have increased

in substantially the same percentage, even if the treaty with that country had not been entered into?

Of course, it cannot be proved either way, but we do have the example of Argentina to bolster the argument that trade treaties are not essential to increased export trade.

Now, let us turn to Europe and see what kind of comparison you find there. We have a trade treaty with Sweden, but not with Norway; yet our exports to Norway increased in almost the same percentage as in the case of Sweden—80 percent as against 81 percent. Thus, all we got out of the treaty with Sweden, after making numerous concessions to her in the American market at the expense of our own producers, was a 1-percent greater increase in exports than to Norway.

France and Switzerland are both treaty countries, but our exports to them increased by only 28 and 26 percent, respectively. On the other hand, our exports to the United Kingdom, which in 1938 was not a treaty country, increased by 30 percent; our exports to Portugal, another nontreaty country, by 39 percent; to Denmark, another nontreaty country, by 56 percent.

As offsetting the 100-percent increase in the case of exports to Finland, a treaty country, we find that our exports to the following nontreaty countries increased by even more: Rumania, 102 percent; Irish Free State, 170 percent; Russia, 183 percent; and Turkey, 292 percent. How do those comparisons sound? It appears that we have been successful in increasing our trade with nontreaty countries as well as with treaty countries.

LUMPING OF EXPORT FIGURES GIVES DISTORTED PICTURE

In lumping the increased exports to all treaty countries and setting them off against the increased exports to all nontreaty countries, as the State Department does, a distorted picture is presented. By looking at our trade with the individual countries we find there is no basis for the State Department's generalization that trade treaties have proven beneficial. Also it becomes apparent that there is no basis for the statement that trade treaties constitute the only hope of regaining our export trade. The fact is that our exports to nontreaty countries are increasing at a rapid rate without costing us anything in the way of concessions in the American market involving injury to domestic producers.

TREATY PROGRAM A COSTLY FAILURE

I stated at the outset that I would refer not only to the ineffectiveness of our trade-treaty program in expanding our export trade, but also to the tremendous cost at which this experiment has been carried on. Like many other New Deal experiments, the trade-treaty program has been an expensive failure. I am not criticizing the principle of reciprocity—that is, true reciprocity—but the present program does not come within that category.

We are giving up more than we receive, because we extend our concessions to the whole world while obtaining concessions only from the individual treaty countries. This in itself is costly and one-sided and is not reciprocity but charity—charity with the American producer's birthright, his home market. It is not necessary to make costly concessions in the home market either to expand or maintain our foreign trade.

NO SENSE IN BUYING WHAT WE ALREADY PRODUCE

Conceding that we have to buy if we export to sell, it does not follow that we have to buy what we already produce for ourselves and therefore do not need. There is no sense in that. That is the argument the gentleman from Minnesota used so effectively this morning, that we are arranging to get from Argentina agricultural products that we raise here ourselves and exclude our own farmers from our own markets. This is the outstanding objection to the present trade-treaty program.

Up to the present time this administration has made concessions of as much as 50 percent on over 1,000 items coming into our market from abroad to compete with and displace our own products. I have frequently referred to many of these items. They embrace the principal products of farm and factory. I should like to have the entire list of reduc-

tions printed in the Record so that American producers could see how the administration now in power has sacrificed their interests in our home market, but the cost of such printing of the enormous number of items precludes that request. A document has been published by the Tariff Commission showing these changes, and the document is almost as large as the tariff law itself. In fact, the intention of the trade program is to write a tariff bill without the authority of Congress. That is where the claim is substantiated that it is not constitutional to so proceed.

NO GAIN FROM GIVING UP DOMESTIC MARKET TO SECURE FOREIGN MARKET

Disregarding for the moment the sacrifice which American producers are called upon to make as a consequence of tariff reductions on competitive foreign products, the fact remains that nothing is to be gained by giving up a dollar or more in the domestic market for each additional dollar of foreign trade realized; yet that is precisely what is now being done under the treaty program. Certain groups of producers are being sacrificed in an effort to expand the export business of certain other producers.

I am opposed to expanding our foreign trade in this way even if it should be successful, which, of course, it is not. One domestic producer has as much right to live as another, and instead of killing off our industries, either agricultural or manufacturing, we should promote and protect home production, realizing that we have right within our own borders the richest market in the world.

Governments are created, not to destroy, but to protect and preserve the people and their livelihood.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR SACRIFICING DOMESTIC PRODUCER

Right now the administration is preparing to enter into a treaty with Argentina, probably with an idea of gaining markets there which formerly went to countries now busily engaged in trying to destroy each other.

But I ask, why, in order to sell Argentina a few dollars more, we should sacrifice the American farmer, as is contemplated?

Why, in order to sell any country any more goods, should we sacrifice any domestic producer or any American wage earner? There is no answer; no justification.

Those who say we must buy to sell apparently forget that two-thirds of our imports in point of value are already on the free list. There is no reason to give foreign producers any greater free market in this country. Let them trade for our surpluses the goods we need but do not produce ourselves.

There is no need for our importing Argentine beef, or British woollens, or Belgian cement, or hundreds of other items I could mention on which our duties have been drastically reduced so as to invite and encourage foreign importations.

RECIPROCITY AND PROTECTION SHOULD GO HAND IN HAND

Reciprocity and protection for our industries should go hand in hand. In our previous experiences with reciprocity under Republican auspices such was the case. It should be the case today, but is not. The present treaty program is simply a backhanded method of bringing about a general downward tariff revision, which this Congress and the country would never stand for if it were proposed in a single measure. That is in line with the inquiry made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] of the gentleman from Minnesota, who was speaking, whether any of these treaties would ever have been confirmed had it been necessary to put them before the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR TREATY PROGRAM EXPIRES NEXT JUNE

Here is the important point, Mr. Speaker: This program, injurious as it is to every feature of American production, was inaugurated in 1934. It was renewed upon its expiration in 1937 for a further period of 3 years, but with fewer votes than it had originally been enacted. It expires again next June, and I sincerely hope and trust that it will not be re-enacted again in its present form. It must not be, and that is one of the issues that we as Republicans must place directly before the country.

I recall having said in the last session of Congress that a great many of our new Members were elected to this Congress

on the basis of their opposition to the trade-treaty program. That program of opposition must be carried out. Not only should these new men be returned to Congress, but many others should take the places of some of the majority at the present time.

I am glad to see that several Democratic Members have joined with the Republican Members in introducing bills either to terminate the trade-treaty program or to require ratification of the treaties before they shall become effective. Only last week the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] introduced a bill of the latter character. The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] would repeal the whole program, and that is not a bad idea.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

NOTICE REQUIRED TO TERMINATE OUTSTANDING TREATIES

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that this authority granted to the Executive to execute these trade agreements should expire by limitation next June, what would be the condition of the treaties already entered into by the Government with these foreign nations?

Mr. TREADWAY. They would not expire. It is simply the President's authority to negotiate and enter into the treaties that expire next June. The treaties will continue in effect until they cease under their own terms or until terminated by either party upon proper notice.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not have the law before me, but I assumed there was somewhere, somehow, some law which would provide for the sanctity of a contract, and if this Government made a contract—which is a treaty—with Brazil, Argentina, or any other country, and there was a time limit on it—for instance, a 3-year limit—that the treaty would be good for 3 years as a result of the agreement entered into.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] calls my attention to a provision or clause in the law which suggests that if these treaties result in the disadvantage to our Government they may be canceled.

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course, it is fair to assume that the present administration, having entered into this program, is not going to say it has been to the disadvantage of our country. Here is the provision covering termination of the treaties as contained in the law:

SEC. 2. * * * (b) Every foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to this act shall be subject to termination, upon due notice to the foreign government concerned, at the end of not more than 3 years from the date on which the agreement comes into force, and, if not then terminated, shall be subject to termination thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want this Government to be placed in a position where it gives its solemn promise in the form or shape of a trade agreement with another country and then repudiates what it has done. I do not want it to be put in that position.

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with the gentleman. We must be fair and honest with other countries.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. It is my understanding these treaties are in the nature of contracts and that they are not to be terminated unless 6 months' notice is given.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is my understanding.

Mr. MASON. We can presume that under the present administration which favors those treaties there will be no 6 months' notice given. It would therefore require, you may say, a change of administration before we could expect to give the 6 months' notice.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is that not what the gentleman expects next year?

Mr. MASON. I was not expressing my hope.

Mr. TREADWAY. I can express it for him. I know what the gentleman's views are on that subject, and they coincide with my own.

Mr. MASON. Of course.

Mr. TREADWAY. For the benefit of the country at large, there must be a change of administration next year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's understanding that in the coming session, beginning in January and ending in June, the question of extending the life of the trade-agreement program will come up?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; it will necessarily have to come up; otherwise, the authority to negotiate these agreements will expire on the 12th of June.

MANY DEMOCRATS NOW OPPOSE TREATY PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, the recent hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the proposed Argentine treaty produced some interesting revelations.

The junior Senator from Texas is credited with having stated:

I voted for the trade-agreement program, but occasionally I have repented my vote.

I am glad of that. Doubtless the same feeling of repentance has occurred to many Democratic Members who voted for the program. Look over the list of Members who have appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information to ask that the duties on the products of their districts be not reduced. There are just as many Democrats as Republicans.

It must be somewhat embarrassing for those Democratic Members who voted for the treaty program to have to appear before the Reciprocity Committee and ask that no reductions be made on the products of their districts. If the program is good for the rest of the country, then it is good for their districts; but, of course, I have always contended that it is not good for the country, so I sympathize with them in trying to protect their people. I want to protect all the people.

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSMAN SAYS TREATY PROGRAM IS ON THE WAY OUT

According to press reports, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] told the Reciprocity Committee that while he voted for the original legislation, he was suspicious of it and voted against its renewal 2 years ago.

He further stated, according to the press, that the law in its present form "is on the way out." I agree with him.

According to an item in yesterday's press, Representatives of 11 Western States were reported by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] to have pledged themselves to seek repeal or modification of the trade-treaty program if tariff reductions on agricultural and mining products resulted from impending treaties with three South American countries. According to our colleague, all but one of this group voted for extending the program in 1937. He is quoted in the press as having stated:

Now, however, every one of us is ready to vote against its further continuation if they are going to trade our products off to the detriment of our country.

It is fine to see some enlightenment on the part of the men who helped to put this program through originally.

Of course, if the administration does not trade off the products produced in the districts of these 11 western Members, it will trade off the products of other districts.

In fact, the reductions already made under the treaty program embrace in some degree at least the products of virtually every congressional district in the country. Under the circumstances, therefore, it seems to me that there ought to be a unanimous vote in opposition to the present program, involving as it does reductions on competitive foreign products which displace our own.

Some of those who appeared before the reciprocity committee in connection with the Argentine treaty have included copies of their remarks in the RECORD for the benefit of Members. I have been interested in what they had to say. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] stated in his remarks concerning his appearance before the committee:

I find myself in somewhat of a predicament in this respect, that in general I favor trade agreements where they can be mutually profitable and beneficial, but they must be reciprocally helpful to obtain my approval.

The gentleman never made a wiser statement than that one, and he is one of our wise Members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been liberal in yielding. I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman and I thank the House.

Our colleague from Arizona then went on to say later in his remarks:

I am not willing to cripple any American industries, certainly not the basic industries of my State, in order to encourage trade.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES CRIPPLED UNDER TREATY PROGRAM

In that statement the gentleman put his finger on the fundamental objection to the present program, namely, that it involves crippling American industries, if not of his State, then of some other State.

I quote from our colleague further because I am in agreement with what he says:

I know, of course, that the committee is looking at the good of the whole country, but it cannot be for the good of the whole country to cripple the livestock industry or the mining industry or the agricultural industry of half our people.

Fine. I applaud these remarks, and I would add that it is not good for the country to cripple any domestic industry in any section in the mere hope of expanding our export trade.

The remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] are replete with Republican tariff arguments to which I subscribe. I quote one paragraph from his statement; there are many others to which I would like to refer. He said:

There can be no justification for reducing the tariff on any of these competitive agricultural commodities when millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury are now being spent in reducing production and in aiding the disposal of the surpluses. The American market must be preserved for the American farmer if agriculture is to receive its fair share of the national income. Restoration of the purchasing power for American agriculture will provide a greater market for industrial products and more employment than restoration of purchasing power in some foreign country. There is no doubt that we might increase our sales of automobiles and industrial products to Argentina if under this agreement we tear down our protection and permit a flood of competitive agricultural commodities to enter this market. But what about the sales that will be lost in the domestic market? Sixty-eight percent of all the automobiles in the world are owned right here in this country.

What the gentleman from Nebraska says regarding imports of competitive farm products applies equally to imports of competitive industrial products, and that is why I elaborate more on this program than did the gentleman from Minnesota. He was limiting himself to one feature. I want to extend it to the broad field of American industry.

Just as our manufacturers gain nothing by securing foreign markets at the expense of agriculture, so agriculture gains nothing by securing foreign markets at the expense of industry and labor.

The American workingman is the highest paid in the world and the farmer's richest market is right here at home.

Under the present treaty program any gains we make in our export market are more than offset by the loss to domestic producers of the home market. On the other hand, when we import noncompetitive products—and there are plenty of them that we need—we do not injure American agriculture, industry, or labor, but tend to increase their prosperity.

The present program of encouraging imports of competitive products takes away the livelihood of large groups of our citizens, beats down our price and wage structure, and works to the detriment of the whole people.

NOT NECESSARY TO MAKE CONCESSIONS TO ARGENTINA TO SECURE HER TRADE

A few moments ago I referred to our efforts to secure the South American market which formerly went to nations now at war. I want to point out that there is no necessity for us

to make ruinous concessions in our own tariffs in order to gain this market. We can obtain it by default, without these proposed concessions on American farm products. Why make sacrifices for something that is free?

In any event, the South American countries have no reason to complain of our tariffs.

They are the principal beneficiaries of the present free market in this country for two-thirds of our imports.

Our duties on competitive South American products are imposed simply to offset competitive advantages in the home market which those producers have by reason of their low production costs and low-wage scales.

There is nothing unreasonable in that.

Those who complain about our tariff rates being too high should realize that there is now on the statute books ample authority for making reductions in our rates where this fact can be shown.

WHY NOT PUT THE TARIFF COMMISSION BACK TO WORK?

We have a Tariff Commission which was set up to make investigations and to propose changes to the President under the so-called flexible tariff.

That law has been temporarily suspended by the trade-treaty program.

Our highly paid Tariff Commissioners are now nothing but errand boys for the reciprocity committee.

They make no decisions affecting policy.

They have nothing to do with the negotiation of the trade treaties.

For all I know they are perfectly free to spend their time going fishing, because so far as getting up information and figures for the State Department is concerned that work can and is being done by the staff of the Commission.

We ought to put our Tariff Commissioners back to work doing what Congress intended they should do, namely, so keep our tariff rates in adjustment that they equalize competitive conditions in the home market as between domestic and foreign producers.

This carries with it, of course, the duty to raise duties where necessary in order to properly protect American producers against unfair foreign competition.

Under the trade-treaty program, as we all know, adjustments in rates are only made in one direction—downward.

Little, if any, consideration is given to the needs of our own people.

In negotiating trade treaties, the foreign cost-of-production advantage may be, and generally is, ignored.

This should not be.

Instead of being relegated to a mere statistical body, the Tariff Commission ought to be carrying out its function and duty of protecting the American market from unfair competition from abroad.

The Tariff Commission was created as a quasi legislative branch.

Its purpose was to carry out the mandate of Congress as set forth in the flexible tariff provisions of existing law.

It has now been turned into a minor adjunct to one of the departments in the executive branch which is exercising the tariff powers which properly belong to Congress alone, as provided in the Constitution of the United States.

If we are to have a body to regulate our foreign trade and promote exports, why not let us do away with the present free-trade program of the State Department and set the Tariff Commission up as an expert body to carry on that function under the guidance of Congress?

CONGRESS MUST DEAL WITH TRADE-TREATY ISSUE AT NEXT SESSION

As I have indicated, the authority for the present unconstitutional and ruinous trade treaty will expire next June. I want to emphasize that feature. Congress will have to deal with the matter of its extension at the coming session in January. Presumably the administration will make an effort to have the authority continued. Therefore, it behooves those who feel as I do about the program to make ready to meet that issue, and when that time comes these gentlemen on the Democratic side who have stated their position I hope will continue to view the case as they have stated they do

at the present time. Perhaps an acceptable substitute program which protects the interests of our own people can be worked out.

One thing is certain, and that is that the Republican minority will make a vigorous and determined effort to defeat the extension of the treaty program in its present form. I need not remind the leaders on the other side that our forces have been doubled in number since this matter was last before us here, nor do I need to remind them that there have been defections on their own side, as I have just recently pointed out—Democrats who realize their mistake in having voted for the program and who are not going to repeat that mistake.

As the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] has truly said, "The law in its present form is on the way out." [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Let me say one thing as to the matter of your having made converts among some of the Democratic Members of the House looking toward repeal, or at least a noncontinuation of this measure when it comes up for consideration at the next session. I was one of a small group of Democratic Congressmen who met this morning to lay plans concerning one of these proposed trade agreements, at which time one of the Members pointed out that there were now 161 Republican Members, probably all of whom would be in favor of repealing this measure or not continuing it, and that if 20 or more Democratic Members from the Middle West, the farming area, and the mining West, should vote with these 161 there would be little likelihood of this power being extended. This remark was made by one Democrat to several others.

Mr. TREADWAY. Right in their own family group?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I think in all fairness it ought to be stated that the Democrats in that meeting this morning from the Rocky Mountain area were thinking directly of the possibility of the great harm which might come to this country and to the mining West through the adoption of a trade pact with Chile by which the present tariff on copper would be reduced. This would indeed be distinctly ruinous to all the copper-producing areas of this country. Therefore, not to give too much aid and comfort to the speaker or to his party in regard to Democratic help, let me say that I know some Democrats who are now in the process of watchful waiting to see whether all the proposed treaties with Latin American countries will materialize. If they do not materialize to our hurt, and we earnestly hope they will not, then, of course, I for one would have no reason to fight the program.

Mr. TREADWAY. In other words, the gentleman is giving warning to the administration today that you want them to look out for the protection of your local interests, otherwise you will go with us for the general interest and for the greatest good of the greatest number throughout the country. I take that to be the gentleman's position, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that there are many Members of Congress, as long as they are not touched with respect to any commodities in their own districts, who are willing to enforce this trade-agreement policy upon the ones that are touched?

Mr. TREADWAY. We get right back to the old General Hancock proposition that the tariff is a local issue. When there is a possibility of the tariff on their local products being done away with, then the well-being of the whole country is jeopardized. But when the products of some other section are involved in tariff reductions, they do not seem to think that the good of the country is affected, no matter how large or important an industry is being injured or destroyed. I

would rather look at it from a broad, national viewpoint. I would much prefer that.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I was, of course, very much interested in the gentleman's speech, and I was also interested in what the gentleman from Arizona had to say about the mining interests. There are a great many Members on the floor here who come from fruit-growing sections, and I would remind the Members of the House that the great central valley of Chile is the greatest fruit and vegetable producing section in the world. They have a man there by the name of Rodriguez who is the Burbank of South America. The time of shipments from Chile to New York or from that fruit-growing section is about 14 days. Their exports are coming into our harbors here in great volume. They have big canning factories with cheap labor, and I understand in this agreement with Chile they are going to open up our markets to all that canned fruit and to these very wonderful vegetables and other fruits. They raise vegetables there that weigh 3 and 4 pounds. They raise melons, in the nature of muskmelons, that are large enough to serve an entire banquet in New York. I am not exaggerating when I make that statement. If we are going to open our markets to all these things, we are simply going to depress the market for our farmers further and further. I think we should be on the alert and realize that this is not a partisan matter.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAWKS. I would like to remind the small group of Democrats who are apparently seeing the light about this thing—

Mr. TREADWAY. The group will be very much larger before June.

Mr. HAWKS. I would like to remind them that in 1940, based upon the returns of 1938, they had better cooperate in the matter of adjusting the reciprocal-trade agreements or they will not be back here in Congress.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, worse things could happen than the departure of some. [Laughter.] There should be enough so that this side would be returned as the majority side. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point in regard to trade agreements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I feel pleased that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has studied my remarks concerning the proposed trade treaties with Argentina and with Chile. I feel honored that he has quoted me at some length. Candidly, I am greatly worried because of the harm that may be done the farmers, livestock men, miners, and other laborers of my State. I have asked for this opportunity to make a little further statement so that the gentleman and other colleagues may not get the wrong impression from what I said.

In the first place, I do not want anyone to think that I am concerned only about the farmers, livestock men, miners, and other laborers of my State. I am interested in such producers in any part of my country wherever they may be found. I am fighting for this class of producers in my State, because I am the only Congressman such producers in Arizona have to fight their battles in this legislative Chamber.

Let me make myself clear on another matter. When I went before the Committee on Reciprocity Information last week, and when I go to the State Department tomorrow, as I am scheduled to do, and when I take the matter up with the President, it is not done to fight the reciprocal-trade program but to fight a possible abuse of that power. I am fighting certain proposals and suggestions which I think never should go in a reciprocal-trade agreement. Agricultural products

from Argentina and copper from Chile have not yet been let into this country in competition with our own production. I think it would be folly to let them in. I do not ordinarily oppose the placing of a gun in the hands of a peace officer. Yet there are certain cases in which I would oppose the use of that gun by a peace officer. This I could do logically without condemning the carrying of guns by peace officers generally.

The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle preceding me have been condemning reciprocal-trade agreements on the ground that they have already done the terrible things which some of us Democrats fear might be done if certain proposals are carried out. We differ from you in that you fight the whole theory of the program and we are fighting to prevent certain abuses getting into that program.

The gentleman has spoken of trade agreements as unconstitutional. Although I am not a lawyer, I doubt that the law is unconstitutional. I believe that it is certainly constitutional. Furthermore, I think that it is a wise provision, assuming that it is wisely administered; but it certainly does afford opportunity for very unwise trade provisions, which might lead, even unwittingly, to great harm to many of our people.

If the delegation of power to the executive department to modify duties on foreign goods is unconstitutional, Republican administrations have been doing that for a long while. If my memory serves me well, President Harding and President Coolidge, and also possibly President Hoover, were given the power by law to modify existing tariff rates up or down to the extent of 50 percent. The theory was then that such modification was to be based on the advice of expert judgment of a group who gave careful study to the general effects of such modification upon our country. Is not that exactly what we are doing now? Today the executive department may modify the existing rates in our tariff system to the extent of 50 percent. Presumably this is done on the advice of a board of experts giving scientific study to the problem in all of its phases and implications. Where is the constitutional difference between the present Democratic Party plan and the former Republican Party plan?

I am not a free-trader. I believe trade between nations can promote peace. Nevertheless, I believe in some trade restrictions and regulations. Of course, the power constitutionally resides in Congress to regulate commerce, but our tariff history—and certainly the history of the making of our various tariff laws—all show that Congress cannot go into the minute detail of such regulation with a large degree of wisdom or fairness. It is wiser that such complicated matters be left to a board of expert men. I believe that it is better so, but I would like to nominate the Angel Gabriel as chairman of that board and let him name his associates on the board. What we in the West are afraid of in connection with these proposed trade pacts is that a board of experts may overlook some facts which have a vital bearing in the matter and take too narrow a view of this great and diverse country of ours.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes tomorrow after the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the special orders that have heretofore been granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KITCHENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, "the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Those words, delivered to the Eighteenth Congress of the United States on December 2, 1823, by President James Monroe, are recognized as basic in determining the foreign policy of this country. Not quite so well known, but equally integral in that message were these words:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. * * * Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy.

The declaration of the Monroe Doctrine was not an accident. It was the direct outgrowth of an interchange of views between President Monroe, his Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, formerly Minister to England, and our then Minister in England, Richard Rush, general observer on continental disturbances in that day.

MONROE WRITES TO JEFFERSON AND MADISON

The correspondence Monroe bundled up and sent first to Thomas Jefferson and then to James Madison, the two living ex-Presidents. I wish that every citizen might read those letters as they have been compiled in a volume on the writings of Monroe. They would find most interesting parallels between the European politics of that day and this.

Thomas Jefferson, writing from Monticello on October 24, almost 6 weeks before Monroe delivered his message, said to the President:

The question presented by the letters you have sent me, is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation. This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us.

James Madison, writing from Montpelier, 6 days later, referred to events in Europe and the activities of the Holy Alliance, and then said to the President:

There ought not to be any backwardness, therefore, I think * * * keeping in view, of course, the spirit and forms of the Constitution in every step taken in the road to war which must be the last step if those short of war should be without avail.

He was referring, of course, to the possibility that European powers might use force to restore Spain in South America.

WHAT JEFFERSON PLACED FIRST

There was another sentence in Thomas Jefferson's letter of October 24, 1823, just 116 years ago this week, which I think should be quoted because it is his due as its author, and also because to my mind, it is the briefest, clearest, most compelling statement of proper American foreign policy that has ever been made. I quote:

Our first and fundamental maxim—

Jefferson said to Monroe—

should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe—

Then comma, only a comma—

our second never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

It might be argued then, with good support, that not Monroe, but Jefferson was the author of what we call the Monroe Doctrine. Another, however, might trace the thoughts of both back to Washington. Suffice it to say that the Monroe Doctrine brought together the finest, truest patriotic utterances of the men who gave this Nation leadership in its early critical years. And most men will join with that son of New England, Daniel Webster, who said:

Sir, I look on the message of December 1823 as forming a bright page in our history. I will help neither to erase it nor tear it out; nor shall it be, by any act of mine, blurred or blotted.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot escape the conviction that deeper than the discussion of details in the pending neutrality legislation is the question of whether we shall dim the brightness of that page in American history.

SIX WORTHY OBJECTIVES

Much of the discussion has been on six worthy objectives which the President, in his special message, plainly told the Congress were achieved in existing law, or could be substantially achieved by proclamation.

The objective of restricting American ships from entering such zones—

The President said—

may be attained by prohibiting such entry by the Congress; or the result can be substantially achieved by Executive proclamation that all such voyages are solely at the risk of American owners themselves.

After all the headlines and screaming of the past few days about the detention of one American ship, I thanked God this morning for a State Department honest enough and fair enough to announce that 21 ships had been detained by belligerents since the outbreak of the European war, 2 of them by Germany, 12 of them by Great Britain, and 6 of them by France.

The second objective—

The President stated—

is to prevent American citizens from traveling on belligerent vessels. And this—

He said—

can also be accomplished by legislation through continuance in force of existing law.

The present Neutrality Act forbids travel on ships of belligerent nations.

The third objective—

And again I am quoting the President—

requiring the foreign buyer to take transfer of title in this country to commodities purchased by belligerents, is also a result which can be attained by legislation or substantially achieved through due notice by proclamation.

The present act licenses exports. Ships must clear. And the President has proclamation powers under a declared emergency.

The fourth objective—

And again I quote—

is the preventing of war credits to belligerents.

Of that the President said:

This can be accomplished by maintaining in force existing provisions of law.

The fifth and sixth objectives, the President said—

Have been amply attained by existing law, namely, regulating collection of funds in this country for belligerents, and the maintenance of a license system covering import and export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Under present enactments such arms cannot be carried to belligerent countries on American vessels—

He said, and concluded:

This provision should not be disturbed.

Six worthy objectives—most of them specifically provided for by existing law, all of them substantially attainable by powers of proclamation. Since that be so, I see no particular value in debating whether they should be conserved by maintaining existing law or by setting them forth in a new bill.

ARMS EMBARGO CRUX OF THE MATTER

The question then reverts to what the President described as the "crux" of the matter—repeal of the arms embargo and/or a return to international law.

The bill now pending in the Senate and shortly to come before this body does not propose a return to international law, for, in the words of Senator PITTMAN—

We relied on international law in 1917, and that was our undoing.

The sole issue of controversy is the proposal to repeal the arms embargo. What arguments have been made for that

repeal? The report of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee contains only one sentence of argument. It says:

It (the arms embargo) is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law, which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or materials in any neutral country.

Since when? Since when have belligerents had the right to buy anything anywhere? Since when have two brawlers been able to command a bystander to sell them guns?

I come from a country not far removed from the frontier West—the Black Hills of South Dakota. Only a few years ago guns settled disputes. But neither in those days nor the present could a bystander supply the guns and long keep out of the fight. Neither in those days of frontier codes nor in these days of statutory law could a dealer or an owner be compelled to sell or supply guns or ammunition to somebody in a fight. Indeed, if one did that today, knowing the gun was to be used for murder, he would be charged with being an accessory before the fact. And had he done it in the old days, he would have been marked as the next victim.

NOT DEPARTURE FROM, BUT DEVELOPMENT OF, INTERNATIONAL LAW

The argument has been modified to say that while an arms embargo was not a violation of international law, it was a departure from it. To that I would reply that instead of being a departure, it is a development of international law. Let us look at the record.

The present arms embargo law was enacted in 1937; but in truth it was only reenacted then. The arms embargo was written into the Neutrality Act of 1935 because, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] so clearly said:

It would seem that by now the nations of the earth would have learned that war does not pay. We have learned it in America. * * * Having learned our lesson, we are determined to set our house in order, so that when the storm breaks we shall be prepared to safeguard as best we can our peace and prevent our involvement, if possible. * * * We will prevent our country or our citizens from selling or furnishing to nations engaged in wars arms, munitions, or implements of war, and this bill does just that. It is permanent legislation.

Was a declaration that we would not sell implements of war a departure from international law, or even something new in our own history? Not at all.

Back in 1915, and again in 1917, we enacted laws that made it a crime against the United States for anyone not merely to sell but to permit battleships, submarines, indeed any vessel or contrivance capable of transportation on water, being sent or taken out of the jurisdiction of the United States for use by any belligerent against any nation with whom we were at peace.

Let me read one section of that act of June 15, 1917:

During the war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such a nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.

The penalty provisions of the statute go even further. They place a penalty up to \$10,000 in fines, 5 years imprisonment, and forfeiture of the vessel, cargo, and equipment for "taking, attempting or conspiring to take" a vessel out of the jurisdiction of the United States in violation of the statute.

And mark you, that is still the law—enacted in 1915, reenacted in 1917. It is in the Criminal Code of the United States. It is a crime to sell a battleship, a cruiser, a submarine for the use of nations at war. Indeed, a crime to sell, or send or take any vessel out of the United States for the use of a belligerent. And what is a vessel?

WHAT IS A VESSEL?

The present Neutrality Act, the act of 1935, and indeed, the bill now pending, define "vessel" to be:

Every description of watercraft and aircraft capable of being used as a means of transportation on, under, or over water.

The old definition of a vessel was:

Any contrivance capable of transportation on water.

Now, I do not pretend to say whether an airplane is a vessel within the meaning of the act of 1917, but certainly a bombing hydroplane would be, and as far as precedents of domestic and international law are concerned, it was no departure for us in 1935 to say that we would not supply implements of war to belligerent nations.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, indeed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have given some thought to the same question, and I first entertained the view that at the time that Congress passed the Embargo Act in 1935 it was adopted as a policy to keep this country at peace with the world, with no war in mind, but upon looking up the record, I find that there is substantial evidence to the effect that a war was going on between Italy and Ethiopia, or at least in the making, and that we passed this bill, it is claimed, for the primary purpose of preventing Italy from acquiring arms in this country with which to destroy a people who had neither money nor a navy, nor means to equip itself with arms and ammunition. Is there anything to that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think possibly that was in the minds of some people, but I hope the gentleman will follow me, because I want to start with 1937 and 1935 and go back through the record and trace the development of the arms embargo as a part of international law and the domestic law of this country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman bring out in his discussion the letter that was written by the Secretary of State to Senator PITTMAN in reply to a letter from Senator PITTMAN, wherein he asked if it would be advisable to lift the embargo on arms shipments to Spain, where the Secretary replied it would not be advisable, because to do so might involve us in the war?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not have that in my remarks and appreciate the gentleman calling attention to it at this time.

Mr. KNUTSON. I suggest that the gentleman incorporate it, because it is pertinent at this point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall do so if a copy can be made available tonight. Resuming, then, were the acts of 1917 and 1915 an abrupt departure from precedent? No. Back in 1907 article 8 of the Conventions on Naval War adopted by The Hague International Conference said:

A neutral government is bound to use the means at its disposal to prevent, within its jurisdiction, the equipping or arming of any vessel which it has any reasonable suspicion of being destined to act as a cruiser or to join in hostile operations against a power with which it is at peace.

And further:

It is also bound to exercise the same surveillance to prevent the departure out of its jurisdiction of any vessel intending to act as a cruiser or take part in hostile operations, and which, within the said jurisdiction, may have been adapted wholly or in part to warlike purposes.

Was that an abrupt break with precedent? No. Back in 1871 the Treaty of Washington, between Great Britain and the United States, bound both parties, among other things, to prevent—

The departure from their jurisdiction of any vessel having been especially adapted in whole or in part within such jurisdiction to warlike uses.

Was that an abrupt departure from precedent? No. Neither for us nor for England. The Foreign Enlistment Act of August 9, 1870, a revision of the Foreign Enlistment Act of 1819, was minute in its provisions to prevent the—

Enlisting or recruiting of men or the building or the equipping of vessels for the military service "of a foreign state at war with a friendly state" (Encyclopedia Britannica 447 and ff.).

Is an embargo on bombing planes in 1917 or 1935 any greater break with precedent than an embargo on battleships half a century or a century earlier? Indeed not.

And the pages of the RECORD are filled with evidence submitted by other gentlemen on the great number of other nations that today have an arms embargo.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman know whether or not the proposed bill—that is, the bill now under consideration in the Senate—contains any provisions with reference to repealing the acts of 1915 and 1917?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Quite to the contrary. The bill as reported to the Senate refers specifically to the act of 1917 in one place and suggests a provision for reinforcing one of its provisions. Hence, far from repealing the act of 1917, the new bill redeclares it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman is correct in his implication to the effect that those laws, properly interpreted, would include the bombing plane, and if we pass the present proposed law, it would be inconsistent with the provisions of the act of 1915 and 1916.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is correct; but I refer that to the distinguished legal authorities in the House, such as the gentleman from Montana himself.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman, in his examination of the statutes, discovered that in 1909 this Congress enacted the specific statute prohibiting the outfitting and sale of vessels of war—battleships and cruisers—and that when the World War came on Secretary Bryan and Secretary Lansing and President Wilson, although submarines were not specifically mentioned in the 1909 act, held by construction that submarines were included and prohibited the shipment of submarines or submarine parts to belligerent nations? That law was enacted in 1909.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is correct; and the act of 1915 was bottomed on the act of 1909.

AN EMBARGO ON OTHER THINGS?

At this point possibly someone is saying, "Well, then, why not embargo cotton and wheat and oil?" My answer is that some day the world may do that; some day the moral conscience of the world may shut off all supplies to belligerents. We are now proposing to put them on a cash-and-carry basis again. But because we cannot draw the embargo line everywhere does not prove that we should draw it nowhere. The other logic would make us repeal the act of 1917 on battleships and earlier laws on enlistment and furnishing of supplies generally.

In the final analysis, then, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to escape the fact that the proposal to repeal the arms embargo is a proposal of intervention. It is hard to escape the frankness of a distinguished Member of the United States Senate [Mr. BURKE] who has said:

I speak no more of the arms embargo as an expression of strict neutrality. It is not that. It checks the belligerents that I want checked. It favors the belligerents that I want favored.

IT IS NOT OUR WAR

Personally, I think England and France will win this war. I hope they will. They can wait it out. It is doubtful if Germany can. But whether they can or they cannot, it is their war, not ours. [Applause.] For, Mr. Speaker, if we accept the other point of view, then we cannot deny the logic of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. On this floor a few days ago he said:

If this be our destiny, then let us now highly resolve that we shall accept it; but let us accept it courageously, boldly, manfully, with our eyes open. Let us solemnly resolve now to plunge this Nation into this new conflict.

Let us once again become the savior of Europe, the hero of aspiring minorities, the champion of self-determinism. Let us wage war again to preserve Europe and make the world safe for democracy. Let us wage war to end war. Then let us resolve that within a quarter of a century we shall do it all over again, and again, and again, until hatred, greed, racial and linguistic animosity and economic desires, ambitions, and covetousness shall have been removed from the European cauldron of war.

In short—

Mr. COX concluded—

let us highly resolve to continue to do so in perpetuity, and let us devise and bequeath that burden to our posterity, so that they, too, may periodically renew the conflict and join the battle, the burden of America, our destiny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Colorado). The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, did our enactment of an arms embargo 4 years ago encourage aggression, or was it indifference at Shantung, jealousy in Ethiopia, self-interest in the Orient, and appeasement at Munich? Shall American blood be shed because other powers abandoned economic sanctions to save spoils of their own? God forbid!

THIS CHARTS OUR COURSE

Mr. Speaker, let me return to the words of Thomas Jefferson, with which I opened these remarks:

The question—

He wrote President Monroe—

presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation. This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. * * *

Let me paraphrase that. I hardly need to do so. The words fit as they are. The question presented by the legislation before this Congress is the most momentous which has been offered to our contemplation. This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of conflict opening on the world.

This Congress appropriated funds to create a memorial to Thomas Jefferson, here in the city of Washington. It is being built today. This Congress is now called upon to test its devotion to the principles of Thomas Jefferson in a more significant way.

I repeat his words again:

Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

Jefferson loved England, respected Great Britain; no doubt would want her to win her war today. In this same letter to Monroe he said:

Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of anyone, or all, on earth. * * * With her, then, we should the most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause.

But note his next sentence:

Not that I would purchase even her amity at the price of taking part in her wars.

Wherein is this war not hers but ours? Wherein is this war not Europe's but ours? Were its issues debated in this Congress? Was it voted by the representatives of the American people? Were its causes created by an American foreign policy? Were the blunderings of diplomacy the mistakes of our ministers? Were the pledges of mutual aid given in pacts of our making? Were the run-outs in Czechoslovakia, in China, in Abyssinia, our desertion of recognized principles of international fair dealing? Did we write or even ratify the wrongs in the Treaty of Versailles?

Of course not. Not in a single instance. And yet it is proposed here to set our compass and point our course on the basis of decisions made in councils where we had not even the minor voice that was proposed in the League of Nations.

ARE WE TO INTERVENE, AGAIN AND AGAIN?

Are we to intervene? Is America to become the make weight in the everlasting balancing of powers that has marked European history for centuries? Are we to do this thing, again and again and again, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has so pointedly asked? Are we to turn our back on the goal that brought brave men to these shores—the goal that here their sons and daughters might be free to live their own lives, worship God as they saw fit, dream dreams, and build their homes away from the domination of governments where people were only pawns for those in power?

It is within the ability of this Congress to give the people of this Nation a rekindled vision of the high mission of the United States. It is within our power to chart a course that will carry America through these troubled times and give greater meaning to the independence of the United States.

Professor Borchard, of Yale, in his brilliant book on neutrality for the United States, says:

A strong neutral is the trustee for civilization in a shell-shocked world.

A similar thought was expressed in a letter received by Mrs. Roosevelt from an English friend and published in her column a few days ago. Borchard continues—

By intervention in European quarrels we can make the situation worse, but never better.

A BETTER DESTINY THAN THAT

Mr. Speaker, there is a better future for the United States than trying again the role of savior for Europe.

That better future means building the United States into a power that can protect itself against aggression. In his immortal message, Monroe said:

It is by rendering justice to other nations that we may expect it from them. It is by our ability to resent injuries and redress wrongs that we may avoid them.

Surely this Congress will do its full part on that score.

That better future for the United States means devoting to the solution of our domestic problems the energy and the expense that ambitious leaders in other nations give to the expansion of their frontiers—and to that we can all dedicate ourselves. We must show that constitutional democracy works, that the Republic lives.

That better future means cultivating good will with the other nations of this hemisphere so that the balance-of-power theory can never find foothold here. The policies that inspired the Panama Conference must be encouraged and sustained. This may cost something, but it will cost far less than a foreign war, and in the end it means an America far greater than can be created on the battlefields of Europe, for it means an America fulfilling her own mission in the New World.

TO DEFEND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Speaker, what I have said in these remarks I have spoken in the utmost kindness and respect for every Member of this body. Every Member has taken an oath—

to protect and defend the United States.

What is the United States? An area of land? A flag? Or a great merging of people into a national soul whose life is liberty and whose purpose is to maintain freedom for men and women to plan their individual destinies, to live their own lives, to die on battlefields only when they have had a voice in the conditions that created the conflict?

The other day I read that a Senator had said his vote would be cast in keeping with a pledge he had made on bended knee before a soldier's coffin 20 years ago. With that same sacred purpose the votes in this House will be cast. And I quarrel with no Member on his motives; I only plead, as all men must, the issues as we see them. Every man knows that boy of 20 years ago, that boy who was a brighter, stronger, finer man than he; that boy who went and never returned. And in devotion to that memory and in loyalty to the boys of today and tomorrow, each Member will cast his vote as he honestly thinks best to prevent our involvement and to protect the independence of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to make an observation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman has made one of the most remarkable speeches in connection with the question before the Senate and House that has been made in either the Senate or in this House. I, for one, am mighty grateful to the gentleman for his great contribution to this subject.

The gentleman has made a statement that I would like to have him elaborate on somewhat. Does the gentleman believe that under the law as it now stands the President may, by

proclamation or otherwise, place on a cash-and-carry basis commodities other than munitions of war?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would so interpret the statement of the President in his opening message to this special session of the Congress. He stated at that time that the result could be substantially achieved by proclamation on both of those points.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And does the gentleman agree with the President in that regard?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I rather think he can. When he has declared an emergency, I think he can.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

TOLERANCE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the essence of Americanism is tolerance. Freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of press—which now includes the radio—the right of assemblage and the right to petition Congress are dependent upon a spirit of tolerance.

These rights, Mr. Speaker, are supposed to be guaranteed by the Constitution and they are supposed to be inalienable rights. But today I want to sound the warning to this Congress and this Nation that one by one these rights are being alienated.

It was Voltaire, I think, who first said:

I do not agree with a word that you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

Mr. Speaker, I have always had some doubt in my mind that there are very many individuals who are broad enough to disapprove of what an opponent says and yet were willing to fight to the death for his right to say it. This quotation is used many times, but I am afraid that it is quoted very much oftener than it is practiced.

I think perhaps a statement made recently by a distinguished Member of this House may in time rank as philosophy with some of these sayings we quote from the philosophers of other days. I refer to the recent declaration of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, when he said, "There are three sides to every question—your side, my side, and the right side."

Mr. Speaker, it is of vital importance to this Nation that we approach this neutrality question with that spirit.

As I said a moment ago, I have always been inclined to doubt that many men would be willing to die to sustain the right of their opponents to disagree with them. But, Mr. Speaker, here is a case where no one has to die in order to sustain freedom of conscience, the right of free speech, and the right of free press. We merely have to be tolerant enough—mildly tolerant enough, if you please—to permit those who may disagree with us a respectful hearing of their views.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the very essence of this Americanism we hear so much about on this floor is the tolerance of permitting those who disagree with us to express their disagreement or their opposition without abusing them, without seeking by parliamentary devices to prevent them from expressing their opposition, without assailing their motives and their characters, without trying to smear them as has been done in the case of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh and other noted and able men who have dared to disagree with the administration on this question of repealing the arms embargo.

No, no, Mr. Speaker, this does not involve at all any agreement whatsoever with the ideas put forward by Colonel Lindbergh in his two radio addresses. But I say that there

is a danger signal waving in this Nation when such an illustrious gentleman as Col. Charles A. Lindbergh can be smeared and by innuendo insulted and accused of being pro-German by the jingoists from the White House down, merely because he dares to disagree with what the Chief Executive wants.

Mr. Speaker, suppose on this issue, the White House view is the correct one and is the surest way to peace. If those who disagree with the White House views are to be silenced by insult and criticism and personal attacks now, what will be the situation if it should develop that the administration's attitude was not the wisest course? In other words, Mr. Speaker, what becomes of the constitutional process of government which is exemplified in disagreement, discussion, and compromise? We have come to that time when it would seem that a citizen, no matter how prominent, how responsible or how fitted by experience to speak he may be, must keep silent or expect to be berated, maligned, and attacked in ways in which he cannot defend himself.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this clear. Our danger here is coming in a subtle way. It is entirely proper to ridicule or to condemn or to disagree or to answer or to argue against an idea or a plan no matter by whom it may be proposed. But I say to you, sir, that free government, the Bill of Rights, Americanism, is being destroyed when sources close to it not within the White House and in the Congress undertake to attack the character and the integrity of those who dare to disagree with the Government.

One of the distinctions of certain governments of Europe which we do not like is that there you cannot disagree with the government.

I confess that I was shocked when I read in a column entitled "My Day" veiled insinuating criticism of Lindbergh that I felt was certainly inexcusable coming from the high source that it did.

To millions of American boys and girls Lindbergh represents the symbol and ideal of clean living, character, courage, achievement, and patriotism. But were he the humblest citizen in all the land, guilty of many errors and failures, he still would be an American, and entitled to express his opinions. Is the America of free men, who are entitled to free expression, a matter of history only?

Mr. Speaker, if the trends continue in the direction they seem to have taken since this embargo question came up, it will not be long until they will be daubing yellow paint on the doors of those who dare to disagree with the Government. Imagine daubing yellow paint on the home of a Gold Star Mother because she dares speak out in behalf of the other mothers.

This, Mr. Speaker, is no longer a question of being neutral, at least it would seem that to be neutral we must favor one side—England and France. We have neutrality urged upon us, we are told that we cannot remain neutral unless we repeal the arms embargo; let us at least be honest if we cannot be tolerant and recognize the fact that it is not neutrality that the administration wants at all. I think there was something exceedingly significant of which the American people ought to take note, when the Chief Executive sat in his church last Sunday while his pastor prayed that God would grant that King George should triumph over all his enemies. I would that every minister and every priest in America would pray for peace and truth, and not for victory for the side that they personally favor, for it is written, "Ye fight and war—because ye ask not."

We should be ever mindful that "the work of righteousness shall be peace."

Dream not that sword and helmet
Are signs of valor true,
For peace hath greater victories
Than battle ever knew.

If we are to accept that intolerance which will stigmatize men like Lindbergh for disagreeing with the Government on this question of repeal of the arms embargo, what will we do if the question arises as to whether or not we shall go into this war with our men and our money?

When we consider the administration's attitude on the question of so-called territorial waters, and when we look at the various other indications in order to try to determine the attitude of the administration, we begin to perceive that we may not be so far from this question of going in with our men and our money as many people would like to believe.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one way in this wide world to be neutral, and that is to be neutral. Regardless of what one's sympathies may urge upon him, regardless of what course emotionalism, propagandized or otherwise, might suggest, it still remains a fact that the only way to be neutral is to be neutral, and that means absolute impartiality between all belligerents.

We must either withdraw from the affairs of Europe or meddle in them. If you are a partner in business, you must take the liabilities along with the assets. "What communion hath light with darkness?"

Mr. Speaker, it is a lamentable and a dangerous condition of affairs when the Gold Star Mothers and the veterans of that other war are accused of being pro-Nazi or anti-American because they dare to exercise their constitutional privilege to write to their Congressmen expressing their views on how their grandsons and their sons may be kept out of another war. Who has the right to charge that they do not know how to think for themselves? Is this a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, or must the people be silenced as in the dictator-ridden countries of Europe?

Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody on God's green footstool who has a right to say something about this question, it is the boys who will have to do the fighting and the dying; it is the mothers and fathers who must bid good-bye to their loved ones and send them off to be slaughtered on the battlefields or to come back home, broken in body and in mind, to drag out the weary days of their existence. I insist, sir, that they more than anyone else have the right to express themselves on this question and that they have that right and must have that right, free from insult, free from character assassination, free from abuse by anybody, and it is the duty of the Members of this Congress to rise in their places whenever necessary to defend that right of the common people to say whether or not their sons shall die in war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to raise my voice in this Congress in a plea for tolerance. I want to raise my voice in a plea for the right of free speech, free press, free radio, free church, the right of the citizens to petition the Congress, and the right of free assemblage.

With that patriot of old, let me again say, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Throughout the years thousands of Americans have died for the cause of liberty. If the time has now come that one must die politically to defend free speech, free expression, the right to assemble, and the right to petition Congress in order to hand on the spark of liberty to our children and their children, I for one will gladly face that fate. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I love liberty. I believe that our task is to maintain liberty at home. God forbid that when the pages of history are written it will be said of America, "They made us the keeper of the vineyards, but our own vineyard have we not kept." [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman, for whom I have a very great regard, being privileged to serve on committees with him, has made a very fine speech and made a good contribution to the subject he treated, but it seemed to me that there is an implication in the gentleman's remarks to the effect that free speech is attempted to be curtailed from the President down. Now I know the gentleman wants to be fair. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the statement made by the President of the United States when he was delivering his message to Congress, when he called us here in extraordinary session, to this effect, that he wanted to accord to all of those people who disagreed with him as to the method that should be used to keep this

country out of war, the same loftiness of purpose that prompted him in taking the position that he does with reference to keeping us out of war.

Mr. CURTIS. I remember the statement and I agree with the statement. I am sorry that it has not been practiced by those who apparently speak for the executive department of this Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me also bring up this question: The gentleman refers to this church incident. The gentleman does not think that the President of the United States should have run from the church when the preacher was giving his prayer, and so forth, does he?

Mr. CURTIS. No! No!

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman does not think that those were the sentiments of the President of the United States, does he?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think they were displeasing to him. The prayer was undoubtedly prepared with the view of pleasing the Chief Executive.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The President certainly sanctioned what the preacher said when he allowed his picture to be taken with him after the services.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, I do not agree with the gentleman there. He did not write the prayer and he did not necessarily agree with the sentiments.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But he had his picture taken with the preacher, and he agreed to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I might have my picture taken with the gentleman, but he and I never did agree. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Edward J. McCormack before the Michigan State Medical Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], under previous order of the House, is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I would regret that even the humblest citizen of this country should suspect that any remark that I may have ever made upon the floor of this House was in the leastwise colored by partisan politics. I presume that I might manifest bitter partisan politics in my official behavior if I so desired. But I do not wish to so act. I was sorry that my long-time and devoted friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], apparently permitted politics to color his discussion of the proposal to enter into a trade agreement with Argentina. This I might also say of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. Speaker, in view of what has transpired and of which the public has been fully advised, it was most unkind and unfair in the gentleman from Minnesota that he should have said that this administration is taking advantage of the disturbed state of the public mind and is seeking to put over something on the farmers of this country, is seeking to give away their best market, their domestic market. The facts in the case do not justify this criticism of the administration, this castigation of the high-minded, patriotic gentleman who heads the State Department.

On August 23 last the Acting Secretary of State issued a press release. In that release he said:

Our trade with Argentina has suffered in recent years for lack of a trade agreement. The trade of certain European countries with Argentina has been developing at our expense under the influence of their commercial agreements with Argentina. The placing of American commerce in Argentina on a footing of full equality with that of our European competitors was a subject which was gone into fully in preliminary discussions. The agreement will enable us to maintain our competitive position in a market of great present and prospective importance.

In the same release the Acting Secretary of State said:

Effecting this agreement with Argentina will be the most important accomplishment of this administration in the field of international relations.

On the same date, Mr. Speaker, the Department of State issued another press release in which they discussed the question of entering into negotiations with a view of effecting a trade agreement with Argentina. In that statement this observation was made:

United States trade with Argentina declined drastically between 1929 and 1932. Since then it has increased, but remains well below 1929. In 1929 the United States imported from Argentina \$117,585,000 worth of commodities. It exported to the same country \$210,000,000 of our own American commodities. In 1932 our imports fell to \$15,000,000, but in that same year our exports to Argentina were \$90,000,000 plus. For the present year they have been built up, our imports amounting to \$41,672,000 and our exports stand at \$86,479,000.

The gentleman from Minnesota said in his condemnation of the policy of forming these trade agreements with other countries that he wanted to return to where American farmers were getting a price better than the price now obtaining under the agreements that have been set up as between the United States and 21 of the other powers. I presume that what the gentleman had in mind was returning to the time when his party was in power. I call attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that even as late as August 15, 1932, when the gentleman's party was in power and when our foreign trade was entirely under the influence of the Smoot-Hawley Act, that the price of beef cattle stood at \$4.35, while in September of the present year the price was \$7.07. Hogs in 1932 sold at \$4.06, while in September of the present year the price was \$7.06. In August 1932 corn was 30.2 cents per bushel, and on September 15 of the present year it was 56.2. In 1932 wheat was 38.5. On September 15 of the present year wheat was 72.7. Butterfat, to which the gentleman referred, was in August 1932 selling at 17.5, but in September of the present year it was at 24.7. Cheese in 1932 was selling at 10.6. In September of the present year cheese was selling at 14.3. Wool brought, on August 15, 1932, 7.4, but in September of the present year it brought 24.3.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has been able to find anything in any of the congressional tariffs that have been set up by the Congress in the past 50 or 100 years that was particularly advantageous to the farmer I would like to know what it is.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Under the operations of the A. A. A. in the neighborhood of 30,000,000 acres of productive land have been retired on the theory of trying to raise farm prices up to parity. Does not the gentleman feel that we should adopt a foreign policy that will not cause idle acres with resulting idle men who increase our relief rolls?

Mr. COX. I take it that the gentleman agrees that it is to our advantage to do business with foreign powers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. To a certain extent that is correct.

Mr. COX. And that we must accept conditions as we find them? We cannot make conditions what we would have them be.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; but in doing that let us not make the American farmer bear the brunt of the deal.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman entirely, Mr. Speaker; we must keep in mind doing something for the farmer, the main purpose of entering into trade agreements with other countries is to bring to agriculture benefits which cannot otherwise be obtained. [Applause.] Let us not fool ourselves. The gentleman knows that there was nothing but misery and distress in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act for the farmer of the country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no question about that, but we should not surrender our markets for farm products to foreign competitors who can produce crops at a much lower cost than the American farmer. Understand, I do not want to return to the days of Hoover and starvation prices, closed banks, closed factories, and hungry people any more than the gentleman does, but on the other hand neither do I want

to take bread out of the mouths of our people who need it and place it in the laps of our foreign competitors.

Mr. COX. There is no thought of surrendering our farm markets to anybody. The purpose as well as the necessity is to broaden such markets. The gentleman is obliged to agree that our farmers are faring better under trade agreements than was the case under congressional-made tariffs.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; but the gentleman does not want to make the American producer and the American farmer the goat in connection with our foreign trade?

Mr. COX. Of course not, neither does the Secretary of State. If I am a special pleader for any group it is for the farmers of the country because my district and State are predominantly agricultural.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will concede then that if the policy results in idle acres it necessarily results in idle men?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I cannot concede that the prosecution of our trade-agreement policy has resulted in anywise to the disadvantage of the farmers of the country. As I have stated, the purpose of the program is to improve the condition of the farmer and the operation of the agreements thus far made have had that effect.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will concede, will he not, that under the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Act the retiring from production of acres of land theretofore producing was done for the purpose of raising the farmer's prices to what we call parity prices?

Mr. COX. Yes, of course.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why should we not adopt a policy so the American producer can produce what he can and give him the benefit of the expanding market, if there is such, the same as we would the manufacturer?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, we expand our foreign markets by increasing our business with foreign countries. The observation has been made in the debate during the day that we should cease to operate under the agreements that have thus far been made. In other words, the contention of the opposition is that we should remain static and do nothing in a positive way to improve the condition of the farmers of the country. Complaint is made because in the notice of intention to negotiate given by the State Department there are agricultural commodities in the list of products on which the United States will consider making concessions to Argentina. Why, Mr. Speaker, Argentina is an agricultural country, even more pronouncedly so than the United States. If we do business with Argentina at all, we are obliged to take in trade some of the commodities that she produces. We take that which our national economy will best stand and we give in exchange to Argentina that which she most needs.

Is it contended by the opposition that we should not trade with Argentina at all?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that particularly in the West and in the northwestern country, where we have rigorous winters, where we are required to feed livestock six months out of the year during some years, where wages are high, where taxes are high, where all of our expenses are high, where the investment in land is high, the farmers are at a disadvantage in trying to compete with foreign competition? How can the American farmer in the West and northwest country, and even in the South, compete with producers down in those lower countries such as Argentina, Brazil, and so forth?

Mr. COX. Maybe they cannot compete.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then why should we compel them to compete?

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman mean that simply because our labor costs, our operating costs are higher than they are in Argentina we should not undertake to do business with Argentina at all?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We should not undertake to do business with Argentina if one class of people is going to suffer as a result of doing that business. The farmer should not be made

to bear the brunt of this trading with foreign countries in favor of the manufacturer.

Mr. COX. There is no intention on the part of the State Department or the administration to make the farmer bear the brunt of anything. There is no thought of favoring our manufacturers. The whole purpose, as I have said over and over again, is to improve the condition of the farmer and all others.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman from Montana seems to be under the impression that the State Department is trying to sell the American farmer down the river by taking away his domestic market. I wonder if the gentleman from Montana is aware of the fact that in 1938 our imports of agricultural products of all kinds were valued at slightly less than \$956,000,000. Of this total one-half was of types such as rubber, coffee, silk, and so forth, not produced in the United States; nearly 30 percent was of types imported over the tariff wall because the United States did not produce enough to meet its requirements; 14 percent was accounted for by sugar, the imports of which were controlled throughout 1938 by quota and less than the 7 percent remaining was accounted for by minor miscellaneous items falling into the competitive groups?

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I suggest this to the gentleman from California: What is the purpose of taking acreage out of production if it is not for the raising of our prices up to the so-called parity prices on the theory of creating a scarcity of the article?

In other words, the American farmer can produce the needs of the American people and as long as he can do that he has the right to that market, because the very moment you take an acre of land out of production you cause to go on the relief roll the people who have been working to produce crops upon that acre.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman and I agree that Argentina has nothing to sell other than agricultural commodities—

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right, and she competes with the American farmer.

Mr. COX. She has nothing but agricultural commodities to give us in exchange for the things she buys.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. COX. Then does the gentleman mean we should not do business with Argentina at all?

Mr. O'CONNOR. If we are going to do business and make our people suffer as a result of doing business with Argentina, then the trade is not worth it. No class of people should be required to lose their shirt in the process.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman loses sight altogether of the fact that this is a general sort of a program, that we are not only undertaking to enter into an agreement with one country but we are undertaking to enter into agreements with all countries. There is no likelihood that in the agreement proposed to be negotiated with Argentina that the farmers of this country will be put to any disadvantage. If Argentina has nothing but agricultural commodities to give us in exchange or in payment for the commodities she takes from us, then, of course, we are obliged to take some of her agricultural commodities or else we do not do business with her. If we cut out one country, then we have disrupted the program upon which we have entered, that is, of ultimately entering into agreements with all the countries with which we do business. We cannot afford to lose the business of Argentina because we export to that country very much more than we import. Our trade with Argentina has been altogether advantageous to our producers. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is, under a special order previously entered, to follow the gentleman from Georgia. I wonder, since this discussion is between these two gentlemen, if this time cannot be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman brought that point up. I was going to suggest that whatever time has been allowed me I shall be pleased to share with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, who, as always, is making a very fine address but one with which, in some respects, I do not agree.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Colorado). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. What we are hearing now is simply a repetition of what we have heretofore heard when proposals to enter into agreements with another power have arisen.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLAND. I take it the gentleman's philosophy is that building a tariff wall around our country, such as we had with the Smoot-Hawley tariff wall, is most disastrous to the farmers of the country.

Mr. COX. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I presume that is recognized by everyone who claims to have any familiarity at all with public events.

Mr. BOLAND. May I say for the gentleman's information that I come from the anthracite-coal fields, and that the Smoot-Hawley tariff wall was responsible for Canada, which was the great market for the anthracite industry, putting a tariff on our coal, with the result that we lost our entire market in Canada and this ruined the anthracite coal district.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as I remarked, there are those who make a calamitous outcry every time the question of entering into some sort of a trade agreement with another power arises. The past record of trade agreements ought to be a guide in the present instance. The 21 agreements which have been concluded should demonstrate that the fears generally have been unwarranted. It is true that some guarded concessions have been granted on agricultural products, but this was necessary in order to get greater advantages for some other branch of industry. However, our country has not been flooded with agricultural products.

Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. BUCK rose.

Mr. COX. Let me yield first to the gentleman from Montana, and then I shall yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What was the purpose—and I direct this inquiry also to the gentleman from California—of holding the hearing with the idea in mind of reducing the tariff on agricultural products from the Argentine if it was not that of making it easier for the producers in the Argentine to get their products on the American market which would result in competition with the American farmer, who has to pay the taxes and who pays the cost of administration of this Government.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the question carries with it a reflection upon a department of the Government that is not justified.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that that is the purpose of the hearing?

Mr. COX. There is no purpose to injure the farmer. The whole purpose is to improve his lot.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Would it not injure the American farmer if a larger amount of farm products of the Argentine came into the American market to compete with the products of the American farmer? Does it not follow as a matter of course that such a procedure would injure him?

Mr. COX. Nothing that has happened thus far in the hearings that have been held on the proposal to enter into an agreement with Argentina and nothing that has happened as a result of making the agreements with the other 21 powers with whom agreements have been made warrants even the remotest suspicion that agriculture will be put at a disadvantage as a result of the agreement now being negotiated.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I make this observation, and then I am through. Of course, any lowering of duties results in

an increase in importations. The gentleman will agree with that statement.

Mr. COX. That might be true, yet there will be a corresponding lowering of the duties imposed by Argentina upon our own commodities, and this will mean there will be a greater flow of our domestically produced goods into that country. The gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is true.

Mr. COX. Perhaps imports would be increased but exports also would be increased. Our exports to Argentina have continuously been larger than our imports.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will also agree that our exports are manufactured articles, perhaps articles we do not need and for which we have no use.

Mr. COX. Probably, to some extent, but the gentleman should keep in mind that we have in the years that have gone by exported many agricultural products to Argentina, and this trade has been considerable.

Mr. GORE and Mr. O'CONNOR rose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will yield for one further observation—

Mr. COX. Let me yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, and then I will come back to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. Much has been said about the domestic markets, but should it not also be borne in mind that the domestic market for domestic agricultural products is also the market of the workers in the manufacturing units?

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman. That is an answer to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I realize that this is a sort of round-table business, but at the same time my contention on these trade agreements, particularly with countries that raise nothing but farm products, is that in being permitted to ship such farm products into this country in competition with our American farmer, he, the American farmer, cannot compete with them, and that fact is putting the American farmer at a disadvantage.

Mr. COX. Let the gentleman and myself understand one another. The gentleman means to say to the House that if he were in control of these negotiations he would never let in any commodity that in anywise might compete with any agricultural product of this country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will qualify what the gentleman states—

Mr. COX. Would the gentleman say that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; I will qualify what the gentleman states by saying that if my policy was such in the permitting of farm products to come into this country as to cause millions of acres of land in this country to remain idle, causing idle men and increasing the relief rolls, then I would change the policy. We should look after ourselves first.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, let me answer the gentleman. A glance at the record that has been made under the agreements thus far set up will be helpful to the gentleman and to the country.

The imports that the Department of Agriculture classifies as competitive agricultural products amounted to \$296,000,000 in 1932, at the bottom of the depression, and in 1938, the last full year for which data is available, these imports had increased to \$477,000,000. In the meantime our agricultural exports increased from \$662,000,000 in 1932 to \$828,000,000 in 1938.

It is seen that the so-called competitive agricultural imports in 1938 were only 58 percent as large as our agricultural exports, which would be approximately the relationship between the years 1932 and 1930.

An examination of the income received by farmers in recent years should indicate that agriculture has not been injured by the imports. For example, the total cash income from the marketing of all farm products, exclusive of Government payments, was \$4,606,000,000 in 1932 and \$7,538,000,000 in 1938.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. In just a moment.

The estimated income for 1939 is considerably above that of 1938.

All major agricultural groups of producers have participated in these increases.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am a farmer myself, and may I ask why you do not compare, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] did, those 12 years, including 1932, with the past 7 years? Why pick out one year?

Mr. COX. That might be done with profit.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. In just a second.

It will be remembered that during the period of 1930 to 1932, the Hawley-Smoot tariff was in operation. During 1938, the trade-agreements program was in effect. Instead of a promised period of prosperity following the Hawley-Smoot Act, the cash income from the marketing of all crops fell by \$1,912,000,000 and the income from marketing of livestock and livestock products dropped by \$2,423,000,000. Income derived from the marketing of meat animals fell by \$1,322,000,000, and income derived from marketing of dairy products declined by \$640,000,000 between 1932 and 1938.

The income received from the marketing of all crops increased by \$1,273,000,000 and the income received from the marketing of livestock and livestock products was increased by \$1,659,000,000. Income from the marketing of meat animals rose by \$1,022,000,000 while income derived from marketing of dairy products rose by \$407,000,000.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I think it should be pointed out that our exports of meat products have fallen materially. Between 1925 and 1929 our average annual exports of pork products amounted to over 1,000,000,000 pounds a year, but due to a series of droughts our exports of pork products fell to practically nil. We have not had a surplus in this country, but we are gradually accumulating a surplus again, and I want to point this out to the gentleman. Beginning in 1922 our exports of agricultural products amounted to approximately 50 percent of our total exports.

Since that time we have gradually been dwindling our agricultural exports, and our nonagricultural exports have been increasing. In other words, agriculture furnished approximately 50 percent of our total exports in 1922, and during the first 9 months of 1939 our agricultural exports accounted for only 18.6 percent of our total exports.

Mr. COX. Permit me to ask this question. Was not the loss of foreign markets to cotton largely responsible for that?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The loss of cotton was one of the items that accounted for a great deal of the shrinkage. We have lost our foreign markets, however, for wheat, and also for pork products. In fact, more attention should be paid to developing more markets for agricultural products, and less attention should be paid to facilitating the exportation of our industrial productions, at the expense of agriculture.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Let me call attention to this. The total amount of agricultural exports in 1933 was \$827,000,000. The total amount of all exports for 1938 amounted to \$1,591,000,000, which shows we are still over that 50 percent the gentleman was talking about, and the decrease for 1939 is unquestionably due to the unsettled conditions of foreign countries.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman's figures would indicate that agriculture furnished over eight hundred million.

Mr. BUCK. And that is over one-half.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. HOOK. I agree with the gentleman that the only way that we are going to be able to retain our world markets is through reciprocal-trade agreements. However, we must be very careful under the most-favored-nation clause. For instance, in this Argentine proposal, in the matter of cheese,

Argentina exports only what is known as the Italian type of cheese, and that is now manufactured in the United States. Argentina exported only \$101,000, or about 1,000,000 pounds, but under the most-favored-nation clause Italy herself exports around about 26,000,000 pounds, and if the proposed agreement for a reduction from 7 to 4 cents is made to Argentina, under the most-favored-nation clause Italy would get the benefit of that reduction on 26,000,000. I think that should be watched very closely under the most-favored-nation clause.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman a short time ago made a very serious accusation against the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], because he alleged they invoked partisanship in their opposition to the proposed tariff reductions on agricultural products under the Argentine treaty. Does the gentleman similarly accuse members of his own party, a score of Senators and Representatives from his own party, who appeared last week at the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, for vigorously protesting against a reduction in the agricultural tariffs?

Mr. COX. I do not accuse anybody. If there is any exception to the remark I made with reference to the political complexion of the addresses of the gentlemen from Minnesota and Massachusetts, I gladly withdraw it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to make one more observation. I ask the gentleman to read the Republican platform promulgated by the national convention in 1932 and the Democratic platform promulgated by the national convention in 1932 and reaffirmed in 1936 on the part of both major political parties. If he does so, he will find that both parties pledged themselves to the American farmer, that they would reserve as far as possible the American market to the American producer. That was done on behalf of both major political parties in 1932 and in 1936. We owe to the farmer the duty of carrying out that pledge.

Mr. COX. And I am satisfied the State Department in endeavoring to carry forth this trade-agreement program, is undertaking to fulfill that promise.

Mr. HOOK. On the question of the type of testimony given before the Tariff Commission, the proposals at that time were submitted for the purpose of giving facts to the Tariff Commission. I happen to have appeared down there, and merely facts should have been presented. I thought while I was listening there that I was listening to political campaign speeches. It was a question of policy instead of facts.

Mr. COX. I dare say the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Would not the gentleman favor restoring to Congress that power which we have delegated, to the extent of ratifying these trade agreements, at least?

Mr. COX. Let me say in reply to the gentleman, the gentleman knows something of the way I feel toward the suggestion that Congress delegate any of its constitutional powers to others. I know, however, that the lesson of experience teaches that we cannot set up trade relations with other powers in a manner to do justice to all, and particularly to agriculture, through a congressional-made tariff. We have had those. The most recent is the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. Does the gentleman find anything in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that is of comfort to him or to agriculture?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. There are certain phases of it, while I will agree that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill as a whole was not an advisable measure.

Mr. COX. Even with Argentina alone, it brought our exports down from \$210,288,000 in 1929 to \$31,288,000 in 1932.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. But would not the gentleman think it would be the proper function of Congress to at least ratify those trade agreements; that is, provide for ratification

in the Senate, inasmuch as all other countries must ratify the agreements?

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will not take me into that field. It might have been well if Congress had attached that condition, in legislating. I do not know. I think, however, it would have meant that we would have had no tariffs except Congress-made tariffs, and they have proven failures.

Mr. RAYBURN. In other words, one man in the Senate might for 12 months hold up the ratification of any of those trade agreements?

Mr. COX. That is a very pertinent objection to the suggestion.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel we ought to develop this foreign trade at the expense of some particular industry, which involves 75 percent of the population of our communities?

Mr. COX. I do not. I think that imports will be better adjusted to conditions in this country as the result of the setting up of these agreements, and that no single commodity will have to take the brunt of heavy imports of competitive goods.

Much criticism has been directed toward the Canadian agreement. In spite of the alleged ill effects of the Canadian agreement on our cattle-raising industry and the comparatively large imports during this year, its representatives as late as October 18 admitted that the condition of the cattle industry were prosperous. The prices for cattle on September 15, this year, were above parity, and that is more than can be said for many other important agricultural products.

As I have heretofore stated, I represent a State and district which is largely agricultural and naturally am sympathetic to the cause of agriculture. We should not forget that agriculture generally has lost out in almost every congressional tariff revision of the past. We hope, and believe—and the record seems to show—that in the present reciprocity program agriculture has more to gain than lose. I can agree, however, with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] said before the Committee for Reciprocity Information when he recently appeared before that body relative to the proposed agreement with Argentina. He said, in part:

I think there are probably some agricultural commodities upon which there are excessively high rates just as there are some industrial commodities upon which the rates are excessive. Perhaps adjustments are needed.

In this reciprocity program the administration, under Secretary Hull, has set up an interdepartmental committee whose duty and responsibility it is to look into the manifold factors necessary for a proper adjustment of tariffs. The proposed agreement with Argentina is under that very process at present. It would be impossible now to indicate with any degree of accuracy the scope and nature of the tariff reductions which this Government will be able to make in the trade agreements now under consideration.

These matters are determined in the light of the information submitted by interested parties in public hearings. Whatever concessions are made, they will be, judging by the past, for the purpose of promoting the economic welfare of our Nation as a whole through the expansion of markets at home and abroad. The experience of previous negotiations should be assurance that every care will be exercised to avoid injury to our domestic producers.

In connection with these expressed fears, I want to point out the following statement which should have a calming influence from the notice of intention to negotiate with Argentina:

The inclusion of any product in this list does not mean that a concession with respect to it will necessarily be granted. The concessions to be granted are not decided upon until after interested parties in the United States have been given full opportunity to present information and views in writing and orally. In the case of many of the products included in this list it may be that no concession will be made; it may be that the existing

import duty will merely be bound, without reduction; it may be that only a part of a given tariff classification, as set forth in the list, will be affected by the agreement; or it may be that a concession, if made, will be limited as to the quantity of the product to which, or the season during which, the concession is applicable.

Just how has agriculture fared in comparison with industry in the concessions obtained and granted? A larger proportion of agricultural than of nonagricultural exports from the United States is covered by the trade-agreement concessions. Farm products making up nearly one-half (46.9 percent) of this country's total farm exports in 1937 are affected by concessions made by foreign countries in trade agreements. Slightly less than one-fourth (24 percent) of the nonagricultural exports are of concession items.

Because many important agricultural export commodities of the United States, such as cotton and some foodstuffs, have in the past encountered relatively few excessive import barriers raised by foreign countries, a considerable proportion of the concessions that have been obtained for these products have taken the form of binding or guaranteeing the continuation of duty-free entry of our exports, or of relatively low tariffs already in effect.

The following table shows the percentages of 1937 export products covered by the various categories.

Percentages of United States exports on which trade-agreement concessions have been obtained (1937 basis)

	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products	Total products
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Reductions in duty and other mitigations of barriers.....	12.9	14.4	14.0
Bindings of existing treatment.....	34.0	9.9	15.8
Total concessions.....	46.9	24.3	29.8

On the basis of the 1937 figures the United States has, in trade agreements, guaranteed the continued free entry of nearly two-fifths—38.9 percent—of its total agricultural imports. This country has also bound existing tariff rates on 1 percent of its total agricultural imports.

Thus the United States, in trade agreements, has granted actual tariff reductions on items which, in 1937, made up only about one-seventh—14.6 percent—of its agricultural imports. In this category nearly one-half was accounted for by Cuban sugar. Until the outbreak of the present European war imports of sugar were controlled entirely by quotas imposed under legislation other than tariff laws.

Excluding Cuban sugar, only 8 percent of the total agricultural imports in 1937 were of commodities on which tariffs have been lowered under trade agreements.

I believe we ought to look at the proposed agreement with Argentina in the light of American solidarity. It will be recalled that last spring Col. Frank Knox, candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket in 1936, made an extended tour of various South American states. After his visit to Argentina, Mr. Knox said:

To sell American products abroad, we must buy what some of our foreign customers have to sell. You cannot always sell and never buy in foreign markets. * * * The largest single export item of Argentina is linseed. We use far more linseed oil than we produce. We could take all of Argentina's linseed and still be short about 60 percent of our needs. We could admit linseed free from duty. It would be a great aid to Argentina and would help us.

We require large quantities of quebracho extract, the wood from which tanning extract is made. We could take most, if not all, of this from Argentina. We use far more hides than we produce. A modification of the tariff on hides is both feasible and desirable. We import wool from abroad. A part of our foreign supply might well come from the pampas of Argentina.

I do not know that I agree with Colonel Knox in all of his statements, and I know many of my colleagues on both sides do not agree with him, but I have presented them to indicate that our reciprocity program is not necessarily a partisan program. Many other outstanding Republicans support this phase of our foreign policy.

We might explore to advantage our present trade position with the Latin American Republics. Taking Argentina alone

during the 15-year period from 1924 to 1938, we sold to that country \$1,542,600,000 worth of merchandise. In turn we bought \$1,055,700,000 worth from it. Although too much stress should not be placed on a mere balance, we sold nearly a half billion dollars' worth more than we bought. During that period we sold to Argentina comparatively large quantities of such agricultural products as apples, rice, tobacco, and eggs.

Tabulations recently issued by the Division of Regional Information, United States Department of Commerce, show that in 1938, 64.5 percent of the total exports and 74.5 percent of the total imports of 20 Latin American countries went to and came from 6 countries, namely, the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom, Japan, France, and Italy. The relative share of each of these countries in Latin American trade is given in the following table:

Value of trade of 20 Latin American countries with selected countries, 1938

(Thousands of United States dollars)

	Exports to—		Imports from—	
	Value	Percent of total	Value	Percent of total
United States.....	553,006	31.5	497,195	35.8
Germany.....	181,683	10.3	238,170	17.1
United Kingdom.....	279,890	15.9	169,748	12.2
Japan.....	23,237	1.3	38,178	2.8
France.....	70,423	4.0	48,759	3.5
Italy.....	26,155	1.5	43,546	3.1
Total 6 countries.....	1,134,394	64.5	1,035,596	74.5
Total all countries.....	1,758,014	100.0	1,390,531	100.0

These figures reveal that from the purely material side the United States has an opportunity to develop permanent, profitable, and friendly commerce with South American countries. It is not a question of launching a campaign to oust others, in trade rivalry, from those markets. The present European war has eliminated much of the European competition and the trade of South America is literally being dropped into our laps, whether we like it or not. The position of leadership in trade is being made rather easy for us. We are the world's greatest creditor nation as well as the world's greatest source of raw materials; we have the facilities for carrying on world commerce. We ought to survey this general field and view the proposed agreement with Argentina in that light. We ought to look at the picture as a whole. The proposed agreement with Argentina is 1 in a series of more than 20. I recall that when the agreement was being negotiated with the United Kingdom about a year ago, representatives of many manufacturing industries expressed fear similar to that now being expressed by agriculture. They looked upon the proposed agreement with the United Kingdom as sacrificing the interests of the manufacturers for the interests of agriculture. It is true there were some concessions granted on manufactured products for the benefit of agriculture. Important concessions were also obtained for the direct benefit of agriculture in the United Kingdom agreement. I am glad to say, however, that the fears of the manufacturers have not materialized. Of course, war conditions may have affected the concessions of that agreement in both directions. The worst fears expressed have not happened in agreements thus far negotiated. I think those of us who continue to support trade agreements have been justified in our position.

The following excerpt from a Republican newspaper, which has not always supported the trade-agreements program, expresses the spirit of my remarks here today:

Of course, no tariff treaty, no matter how carefully framed, would please everybody. In that respect a tariff treaty is precisely like an ordinary tariff law. But cannot there be more unity than there now is, between Democrats and Republicans, about the general purpose and effects of the reciprocal-trade program?

At the present time we should indicate an open-minded determination to establish beneficial trade relations with Latin America. The area of new negotiations should be expanded when possible. The experience of the past 5 years

should not now be jettisoned. The negotiations in progress with such countries as Argentina, Venezuela, Uruguay, and Chile are a part of this vital effort to maintain solidarity on the American Continents. We now have an opportunity to place the trade relations between this country and some of the important nations to the south on a basis of greater mutual advantage. This can be done to the undisputed benefit of both sides, and at the same time to strengthen the ties of friendship and good will in the Western Hemisphere. These factors are vitally important to our common security in a world now harassed by war.

POISON GAS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is agreeable with the other gentlemen, who have kindly consented that I may have 1 minute at this time, providing there is no other objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection that the gentleman may proceed for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 18 years, having a brother in the veterans' hospital at St. Cloud, Minn., it has been my duty to go there two or three times a year to visit him. I see him and some 700 other boys there, most of them in that institution, if you please, because of poison gas and shell shock, a grim reminder of the last World War. Today I am deeply shocked by the action of the body at the other end of the Capitol, wherein an embargo against the exportation of poison gas was refused by a vote of 54 to 36. I repeat, I am deeply shocked that any parliamentary body in this world would vote to ship poison gas, of all things, out of this Nation, of all nations, supposedly a free, peace-loving Nation, dedicated to the preservation and not to the destruction of mankind. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] had consumed 10 minutes of the time of the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. I gave the gentleman the time, as I was having a very interesting discussion with the gentleman.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very fine speeches today on the question of neutrality and the question of trade agreements.

As the Representatives from Montana are very modest, diffident, and backward about asking for time [laughter], I feel that I want to carry on that habit or practice. Therefore I am not going to take the time that has been so generously given me by the Members of the House, and with the consent of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], I move that the House do now adjourn. [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is another special order.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] is entitled to recognition for 20 minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I might have agreed with the gentleman's motion to adjourn, but I believe he will appreciate some of the information that may be made available to him here.

I recognize that there have been a great many speeches made on this floor, both today and other days, on the subject of neutrality, and I do submit that possibly we will have something a little different to present at this time.

There has been much loose and unsubstantiated talk about the purposes and effects of the Jeffersonian embargo and nonintercourse acts. Therefore and with no other immediate interest than historical accuracy, I here propose to discuss these two measures and the causes of the War of 1812.

The study which I have made is not complete, nor has all of the data been exhausted, but it is based on the best secondary authorities available and should prove quite sufficient to inform the Congress as to the studied conclusions of the majority of the recognized historians of the period.

LXXXV—61

After a very brief portrayal of the background we will turn specifically to the embargo and nonintercourse acts and then to the causes of our second war with England.

In 1792 a war broke out in Europe that was to involve England and the continent almost continuously from then until 1815. Our young Republic, guided by the wise neutrality proclamation of President Washington, enjoyed from 1792 till about 1806 perhaps the most prosperous times in its history. Our commerce in particular grew by leaps and bounds. Following the renewal of hostilities in 1803, and particularly after 1806, American shipping was increasingly caught in the cross-fire of Napoleon's continental system and England's blockade policy. These two systems were embodied primarily in Napoleon's Berlin and Milan decrees and successive orders in council promulgated by the British Government.

These acts and the flagrant violations of our neutral rights gave us abundant provocation for war, but the United States was not prepared for war. Furthermore, Jefferson and later Madison were essentially pacifistic in their outlook. They sought to find some means short of actual conflict to secure the treatment that we as a sovereign power were entitled to.

The Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts were their replies to blockade and interference with American rights, and they had the support of the great majority of the Republican Party which controlled Congress during the period. These measures may best be accounted for by the desire of Jefferson and his colleagues to exert economic pressure upon the belligerents by depriving them of our goods which they sorely needed. Although Jefferson did recognize the fact that the embargo would safeguard our shipping from seizure, it seems clear that Jefferson and the Republicans looked upon it primarily as an economic sanction, as a means of bringing about the observance of our neutral rights without going to war. There is abundant evidence to support this thesis and the preponderance of historical opinion subscribes to it.

Fundamentally it appears that Jefferson had been a firm believer in the efficacy of a policy of economic coercion from Revolutionary times. He remembered the effect of the nonimportation policy in 1767-70 in securing the repeal of the Stamp Act and the Townshend Acts. Between 1789 and 1794 Madison, largely at the instigation of Jefferson, three times proposed in Congress commercial retaliation against Great Britain. The report on commerce, prepared while Jefferson was Secretary of State, was less definite as to an embargo but advocated commercial reprisals against European powers guilty of discriminating against American trade. So the acts of 1806-12 represented the evolution of a theory which Jefferson had been developing over a period of several decades.

But let the historians tell the story.

On July 16, 1810, after Jefferson had retired from office and the embargo had been repealed, he wrote Henry Dearborn:

I have ever been anxious to avoid a war with England unless forced by a situation more losing than war itself, but I did believe we could coerce her to justice by peaceable means; and the embargo, evaded as it was, proved it would have coerced her, had it been honestly executed. (Paul L. Ford, editor, *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, XI, 144.)

Henry Adams, the leading historian of the Jeffersonian period, has the following to say about Jefferson's policy in 1806:

He believed implicitly in the efficacy of commercial restrictions; he thought the Nonimportation Act a better guaranty of good treatment than the best treaty ever made and was quite ready to try the experiment of such a measure against England. (Henry Adams, *History of the United States During the Second Administration of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. I (vol. III of series), 411.)

As to the Nonintercourse Act of April 18, 1806, Edward Channing states:

The law was plainly designed as a club to be used by the American negotiators in London. (Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, IV, 357-358, IV, 358.)

Claude G. Bowers, a former distinguished keynoter at a Democratic National Convention and an apologist for and

defender of Jefferson, also concurs with the historians just cited. He has written:

Jefferson was hopeful that the closing of the American market, if rigidly enforced, would soon drive England to terms without the drawing of the sword. (Claude G. Bowers, *Jefferson in Power*, pp. 453-454.)

Need more be advanced to prove that the Jeffersonian Embargo and the Nonintercourse Acts were economic sanctions—weapons forged as instruments of offense against the crippling policies of England and France rather than neutrality measures? If more evidence is needed that these laws were part of a commercial struggle as distinct from armed conflict, I have that evidence here and will gladly submit it.

Now let us turn to a consideration of the causes of the War of 1812. At the outset it must be pointed out that neither the embargo which expired in 1809 nor the Nonintercourse Act nor Macon's bill No. 2 were important causes. In fact, they were not causes at all. Soon we shall see that they might possibly have prevented the war had they been maintained.

I should also note that despite 2 years of professional research in the period of American history under discussion I have yet to find an authoritative statement which says that the Jefferson-Madison policy of economic sanctions was a cause of the war. In fact, I never saw or heard that statement in any form, substantiated or otherwise, until last September 21, when the Congress was reconvened in extraordinary session.

However, let us not be content with the absence of evidence. Let us see what the historians think caused that war.

J. H. Latane writes in *A History of American Foreign Policy*:

June 1, 1812, President Madison laid before the Congress a full statement of our grievances against England. They included the impressment of American seamen, the hovering of British cruisers within our territorial waters, the insolent conduct of officers in searching American vessels, the illegal blockade and restrictions upon American commerce established by the orders in council, the attempt to dismember the Union, and, finally, the intrigues with the Indians of the Northwest. (J. H. Latane, *A History of American Foreign Policy*, p. 143.)

S. J. Bemis, in *A Diplomatic History of the United States*, on page 156 declares:

It must be said at this place that the question of neutral rights could not alone have caused the War of 1812. The maritime constitutions of the Union voted against it. * * * A study of the debates and vote in Congress shows most of the navigating interests voting nay, and the interior, particularly the whole frontier in a great crescent from Vermont to Louisiana, voting aye. * * * War offered the opportunity of quelling these Indian conspiracies forever and at the same time, so the western "war hawks" thought, a conquest of Canada. On the other hand, the Southern and Southwestern States united with the rest of the West for war because they hoped that it would bring to them a conquest of Florida from Great Britain's feeble ally, Spain. The War of 1812, therefore, was finally caused by a western expansionist urge rather than solely by the just grievances of neutral rights and impressment.

We should remember that the new Congress which convened on November 4, 1811, contained 70 new Members, most of whom were young men and most of whom have always been classified as "war hawks." Henry Adams, in volume VI, page 123, the works previously quoted, records that the "war hawks," Clay, Calhoun, and the rest—

Bent on war with England, they were willing to face debt and probable bankruptcy on the chance of conquering Canada and carrying the American flag to Mobile and Key West.

Channing, on page 447 of his book, lists another factor. He points out that—

Monroe came into office (as Secretary of State) with a serious and firm conviction that the American Government must resent the usage it had received by an appeal to arms. These opinions he held forth day and night and was more responsible than anyone else for the declaration of war.

Allen Johnson, in volume 15 of *The Chronicles of America*, page 208, points out an interesting factor to consider, but one which is not fully subscribed to by historians generally. I read from his book:

The personal question which thrust itself upon Madison at this time was, indeed, whether he would have a second term of office. An old story, often told by his detractors, recounts a dramatic inci-

dent which is said to have occurred just as the congressional caucus of the party was about to meet. A committee of Republican Congressmen headed by Mr. Speaker Clay waited upon the President to tell him that if he wished a renomination he must agree to recommend a declaration of war. The story has never been corroborated; and the dramatic interview probably never occurred; yet the President knew, as everyone knew, that his renomination was possible only with the support of the war party. When he accepted the nomination from the Republican caucus on the 18th of May he tactfully pledged himself to acquiesce in the plans of the "war hawks." Some days later an authentic interview did take place between the President and a deputation of Congressmen headed by the Speaker, in the course of which the President was assured of the support of Congress if he would recommend a declaration. Subsequent events point to a complete understanding.

All of these authoritative statements indicate one thing clearly, namely, that the Embargo and the Nonintercourse Acts did not involve us in the War of 1812. But we are not yet through. Let us regard how nearly they succeeded in keeping us out of that war. As a matter of mere chronology, the English Government acquiesced on June 17, 1812, and suspended the operation of the orders in council just 24 hours before the United States declared war. In truth, Castlereagh had announced on June 16 that they would be suspended. But let us again turn to those who know.

Turning to the work of Professor Bemis, I read from page 157:

Because of their failure to prevent war, Jefferson's expedients have long since been the laughingstock of historians. It is only fair to concede that if an Atlantic cable had existed in 1812 there might today be extolled everywhere by amiable and philosophical lovers of peace as an effective and bloodless remedy for the gravest international difficulties. The vote in Congress showed only a small majority for war. It is quite likely that had the impending repeal of the orders in council been known in Washington the declaration of war would not have carried the Senate.

Henry Adams, writing again of Jefferson in volume IV, page 464, concludes:

Yet he clung with more and more tenacity to the faith that his theory of peaceable coercion was sound; and when, within a few months of his death, he alluded for the last time to the embargo, he spoke of it as a measure which persevered in a little longer, we had subsequent and satisfactory assurance would have effected its object completely.

Turning once more to Allen Johnson, page 212, he states:

It is one of the bitterest ironies in history that just 24 hours before war was declared at Washington, the new ministry at Westminster announced its intention of immediately suspending the orders in council. Had President Monroe yielded to those moderates who advised him in April to send a minister to England, he might have been apprised of that gradual change in public opinion which was slowly undermining the authority of Spencer Perceval's ministry and commercial system. He had only to wait a little longer to score the greatest diplomatic triumph of his generation; but fate willed otherwise. No ocean cable flashed the news of the abrupt change which followed the tragic assassination of Perceval and the formation of a new ministry. When the slow-moving packets brought the tidings, war had begun.

Finally, let us consult James Truslow Adams. He declares on page 66 of his *History of the United States*:

Jefferson had "kept us out of war," but at a price which the people were unwilling to pay, and his hope of showing Europe that, instead of armed action, there are "peaceable means of repressing injustice by making it the interest of the aggressor to do what is just and abstain from future wrong" had proved vain. It is impossible to say whether he might have been successful had the people stood by him, not engaged in smuggling, and had kept their ships at home. The Federalists who blamed him most were the worst offenders in undermining his policy, and in any case he underestimated that preference for profit to patriotism, which is always in evidence in every crisis and which a statesman has to allow for.

Perhaps that last statement will bear repetition:

He underestimated that preference for profit to patriotism, which is always in evidence in every crisis.

Thus we could go on heaping fact on fact, but all this should be enough to prove that the Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts were in no way analogous to our present Embargo and Neutrality Acts in purpose. It should be enough to prove that these economic sanctions of Napoleonic times were not the causes of the War of 1812. It should be enough to prove that the Jeffersonian Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts came very close to preventing an unnecessary war and came very close to establishing a new instrument of national policy as a substitute for throat cutting. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today throughout the Nation, in the mind of every surviving member of American wars and in the minds of American parents, there is a feeling so intense because of the neutrality issue that fist fights occur between old friends and former war buddies. It would appear that most discussions on neutrality are ended in a heated and frequently bitter controversy.

How can we keep out of war? Will the lifting or the retention of the embargo provision answer that question? That is the problem of the hour and the problem which rests heavily upon the people of America at this time. The membership of the House knows how much I abhor war and love peace, for the reason that I have on numerous occasions presented arguments and offered resolutions aiming at keeping America out of war. The thought of bloodshed for no purpose, which is war, is sickening to me and something against which we all revolt.

My colleagues, at this very minute America is faced with another kind of war even more sinister in its effects because it is destroying the morale and traditions of our beloved country. I refer to communism. I cannot remain silent while this menace spreads its filthy tentacles around this country that we all love and prepares for it a fate more dreadful than on the field of battle.

Daily we read of the activities of our congressional investigating committee, and from the testimony before that committee we learn of traitorous characters that were forced to flee from their respective countries through fear of death. "America for safety" was their slogan. They came to America with only a sneer for Old Glory and not an ounce of gratitude in their whole carcass. Some of them came here not to escape political oppression but as "missionaries of hate" determined to sabotage our institutions and to spread a gospel foreign and treacherous among our children. In addition to poisoning the minds of the youth of our country, they have tried to create a state of unrest among our working men and women. Yes, they have done even worse. The ships of our Navy have been damaged by sabotage, and American factories, so vital to our national defense, have been constantly endangered by these treacherous leeches. Their disciples have found their way into the Government "white collar" organization, as well as among our soldiers and sailors.

In spite of all the harm that has been done, nothing apparently has been done to correct the situation. Our courts seem helpless to deport them and our officials seem reluctant to prosecute them, but all the while they continue to do their dirty work, using the pulpit, radio, and the press. My boy and yours, and yours, and yours, Members of the House, are being slowly indoctrinated with these poisonous ideas of social life, religion, and government, just as the least intelligent of our workers are being lead away from the principles of American democracy. God pity us that a sizeable number of our more intelligent citizens have gone over to this communistic program of destruction.

In the parade of witnesses before the House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, have been some of the most contemptible creatures our liberal naturalization laws allow to be called citizens. They have brazenly told the committee that they would refuse to fight for America and they have admitted being engaged in espionage work against the best interests of our country. For their testimony, in which they admitted committing perjury and other capital crimes, they have been loudly praised in many quarters.

Earl Browder, head of the Communists in the United States and now under indictment in the Federal court for perjury as well as other Communists, have admitted that they traveled on falsified passports to Russia so that they could bring back to this country specific directions from that devil Stalin.

We are constantly receiving mail that is distinctly communistic propaganda. There seems to be no limit to the finances or gall of the individuals who are directing this campaign.

I have received recently from this same Browder a copy of a speech he made recently in Philadelphia. He said that Americans who want to keep out of this war should be in a position to understand and sympathize with the determination of the Soviet Union not to be used as a cat's-paw for one or another imperialist camp to pull its chestnuts out of the fires of war. Then he adds:

But the Soviet Union has done much more than merely keep out of the war. Without engaging in a war it has been able to accomplish what all the rest of the world confessedly failed to do. It drew the line far from its own borders beyond which Nazi aggression dared not go. It even was able to force the Nazi military machine to retire and to redeem more than half of that Poland which the British-French Governments, with all their paper guarantees, had cast to the Nazi wolves. The Red Army marched. The Red Army marched into western Ukraine, White Russia, and Poland.

Our American newspapers leaped to the defense of Chamberlain like a pack of well-trained hunting dogs. They leaped forward without a second's hesitation; they knew all the answers in advance. They didn't have to think a single moment before they began to vilify the Soviet Union, brand the march of the Red Army into western Ukraine, White Russia, and Poland on its mission of liberation and protection, as a "partnership in aggression" with the Nazi aggressors. But already, before the month of September is over, when war has been going on less than a month, through all the howling of the dogs of reaction, the truth forces its way through for all the world to see.

The most rabid anti-Communists in America, who happen to have family connections in Poland, are publicly praying that their relatives may find themselves in the area occupied by the Red Army. American newspapermen in Rumania are forced to note in their dispatches that refugees who fled across the border before the advance of the Nazi armies, returned immediately to Poland when they learned that the Red Army had come.

Behind the Red Army lines the peasant masses, long among the most exploited and oppressed in Europe, are fulfilling their age-long dream of undisputed possession of the land. It is their land for the first time in history. The quarter-of-a-million-acre estate of Prince Radziwill was one of the first to be distributed among the landless peasants. That is why they are so profoundly angry with the Soviet Union and the Red Army. They are angry because they know that this news that the land is being distributed to the men who dig the land and who raise the crops, that news they can't stop from spreading like wildfire throughout Europe and the rest of the world, especially throughout eastern Europe. The peasants are getting their land, and no censorship and no blockade can stop that news from penetrating over the world. And let us not forget that eastern Europe, as well as central Europe, including Germany, rests upon the foundation of a land-hungry and exploited peasantry, who are going to learn this news and are going to watch for the day, which is coming soon, when they can do the same thing in Germany and eastern Europe.

What would happen, I ask you fair-minded persons, if an American went to one of these "ism" countries and sought to wash himself of past sins by a confession? Rascals that have not the courage to go back where they came from but who come here and are received with certificates of citizenships.

I am sure that almost every Member of this House read the recent stories in the Saturday Evening Post by a General Krivitsky, a former Soviet military intelligence chief, who fled to this country for his life. They were enthralling articles, probably true. But I ask you, colleagues, why should such a person be allowed the sanctum of our country?

There was a Maurice Malkin, who told of fabulous espionage activities, admitted a prison record for "slugging." Another fine American.

Then there was a Ben Gitlow, deposed head of the American Communist Party. He told of forged passports, counterfeiting of American money, other crimes against the United States. But he said he quit the organization and was thus washed of his sins.

It does not take a thief to catch a thief, any more, Members of the House. Our excellent Federal Bureau of Investigation has demonstrated that. There is no more room in municipal police departments for such characters.

But who do we find as chief investigator of the Un-American Committee? Mr. J. B. Matthews. Check up on his past record and his brazen attempts now to chase down his former comrades.

Just the other day, the committee questioned a former member of the Communist Party, guarded by a police escort who brought him here from a prison cell in North Carolina. He said that the Communist had gone away down to North Carolina to foment a textile strike to promote a Communist organization. He is serving a sentence from 17 to 20 years for conspiracy to murder a police officer at Gastonia.

Almost at the same time, the Ford Motor Co. expelled 51 Russian experts, who had been given the courtesy of the plant ostensibly to study manufacturing methods. But they really sought to steal plans.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, let us think seriously of this situation. War means death, crippled bodies, and dependents which this Government will forever support.

But this dreadful spread of communism is even worse to consider. It seems the destruction of religious freedom, of economic safety, political parties—the ruin of democracy.

It is not necessary to review the alliance of Russia and Germany. Hitler is more frightened than ever in his life. Well he might be. When Stalin is ready to take over, Germany is doomed. Not from bullets, but communism.

Now is the time for us to take steps. We have a wonderful organization within the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But best of all, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Spanish-American Veterans and, too, there are still a number of those glorious old soldiers of the Civil War who could wield a cane with plenty of vigor. Every one a proven patriot, and every organization solidly united toward the eradication of this danger.

These veterans have demonstrated their patriotism. They have posts scattered throughout the country, and there is no finer group or more vigilant men and women who are anxious, even eager, to meet this insidious threat to the tradition of America. They despise these "isms." Turn them loose with the best wishes of this Congress. But let us put some teeth in laws to care for these filthy Communists, and then offer to these war veterans the full assistance of that splendid organization, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Do this, and over night these rascals will take to cover. I propose that Congress invite these organizations to enlist themselves for the duration of the war against communism.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7601. A bill to amend section 907 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing negotiations for the acquisition of certain territory in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PACE introduced a bill (H. R. 7602) for the relief of Emory N. Jenkins, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 a. m., on the expiration of the recess. The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, creator and preserver of all things visible and invisible: We give Thee thanks for those things which no man has seen or can see, yet have reality for us, as suggested by things which are seen and do appear. We bless, Thee, O God, for that which is known only to the pure in heart, which transcends mere human knowledge; give to us this day an open vision and the inspiration that comes of character and grows in us as we grow in life and being. May it be ours to think and say and do only such things as shall be pleasing unto Thee and shall promote the safety, honor, and welfare of the people of the United States and amity and peace among the nations. Grant that more and more we may find kinship with the large and loving soul of Him in whom Thou didst reveal the fullness of the Godhead bodily, who came that we might have life and have it more abundantly, Jesus, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 26, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	La Follette	Schwartz
Andrews	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Austin	Ellender	Lucas	Sheppard
Bailey	Frazier	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bankhead	George	McCarran	Slattery
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Smathers
Barkley	Gibson	McNary	Smith
Bilbo	Gillette	Maloney	Stewart
Borah	Green	Mead	Taft
Bridges	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Tobey
Burke	Harrison	Neely	Townsend
Byrd	Hatch	Norris	Truman
Byrnes	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chavez	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Danaher	King	Russell	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SEPTEMBER REPORT OF THE R. F. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of September 1939, including a statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of the Young People's Forum Committee, Mary Hardman, chairman, praying that the United States call a conference of representatives of the nations to take steps to stop the war in Europe, so as to bring about an effective peace, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the West Texas County Judges and Commissioners' Association and city officials at Lubbock, Tex., favoring the redistribution and reallocation of W. P. A. funds so as to increase the quotas and amounts available for relief of the unemployed in drought-stricken agricultural areas such as west Texas, which was reported to the Committee on Appropriations.